Beginning of

Origin and development of sacramentalism

This title was preceded by

The geography of the Gospels

And is continued by

Immortality in Plato in the New Testament and in modern Christian thought

A proposed religious education curriculum for a girls' high school in Japan

Search by above titles on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1934 call number Thesis Cage 1934 v.2

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/origindevelopmen00unse

ORIGIN and DEVELOPMENT
of
SACRAMENTALISM

By
Shigemi Kega,
Theological Seminary
of
Aoyama Gakuin, Tokyo, Japan, 1924.

Thesis
Submitted in the
Department of History of Christianity
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for the Degree of
Master of Arts
in the
Pacific School of Religion
1934

C O N T E N T S

INTRODUCTION

PART I. ORIGIN OF SACRAMENTALISM

(I) WAS JESUS A SACRAMENTALIAN?

(2) PAUL, THE FOUNDER OF SACRAMENTALISM

(3) HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF THE ORIGIN OF SACRAMENTALISM

(i) The Lord's Supper and The Mystery Religions

(ii) The Lord's Supper and Judaism

PART II. DEVELOPMENT OF SACRAMENTALISM

(I) THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE

(i) Common Meal at Jerusalem

(ii) Pauline Conception of the Lord's Supper

(2) SACRAMENTALISM IN THE SECOND CENTURY

(i) Didache

(ii) Pliny's Letter to Trajan

(iii) Ignatius

(iv) Justin Martyr

(v) Irenaeus

(vi) Summary

(3) SACRAMENTALISM IN THE ANCIENT CATHOLIC CHURCH

(A) GREEK FATHERS

(i) Origen and His Followers

(ii) Cyril of Jerusalem

(iii) Gregory of Nyssa and Theodore of Mopsuestia

(iv) Chrysostom

(B) LATIN FATHERS

(i) Tertullian

(ii) Cyprian

(iii) Ambrose and Pseudo-Ambrose

(iv) Augustine

(C) SUMMARY

CONCLUSION

NOTES

BIBLIOGRAPHY

GENERAL ABBREVIATIONS

ABC ---------- The Abingdon Bible Commentary.

ANF ---------- The Ante Nicene Fathers.

CE ---------- The Catholic Encyclopedia.

EB ---------- Encyclopaedia Biblica.

HDB---------- Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible.

HDCG --------- Hasting's Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels.

HERE --------- Hasting's Encyclopedia Religion and Ethics.

ICC ---------- The International Critical Commentary.

ISBE --------- The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia.

JE ---------- The Jewish Encyclopedia.

NPNF --------- The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF SACRAMENTALISM

A Study of the History of the Eucharist in Ancient Christian Era

INTRODUCTION

Christianity is a religion of life-experiences. It is not an illusion of the fanatic or a system of thought. Jesus' experience of unity with God is the very source of Christianity. His personality contains a unique God-consciousness, as it is called by Ritschl, as its central element. It makes his followers dare to die for him, because they are sure of living in Divine grace through their Christ-experiences. Fellowship between man and God and brotherhood between man and man are the great ideals for which Jesus made an effort to attain. The origin and history of the sacraments clearly shows the fact mentioned above. The Lord's Supper or the Eucharist is the preeminent one. Hence the popular calling of the same rite the "Sacrament".

The sacramental institution, i.e. the Lord's Supper or the Eucharist, is derived from the Last Supper of the Saviour with

his disciples. Paul calls it "the Lord's Supper"(I Cor. xi:20) and he uses as its synonyms "the Lord's Table" and "the cup of the Lord"(I Cor. x:20). "Eucharist" is the term applied to the Lord's Supper in the primitive church. It means, however, in the early Christian literature: (i) the prayer of thanksgiving spoken over the elements; (ii) the elements, i.e. the sacramental bread and wine themselves; (iii) any consecrated elements. In the East it was also called "the Mystery" because only the initiated participated, while in the West "the Mass" (missa or missio) because the children and catechumens, or unbaptized believers, were dismissed before the Eucharistic rite began. In the post-Apostolic period the term "sacrifice" was used as a rehearsal of Christ's Passion, and it was also named "λειτουργία" whence the word "liturgy". From then ecclesiastical Sacramentalism flourished down to the Reformation in which period the Sacramental controversy prevailed among church leaders.

Sacramentalism has had an influence throughout European history not only upon the ecclesiastical history and polity, but also upon literature, art, music, philosophy, politics, social life, etc. The "Last Supper" gave Leonard da Vinci and del Sarto everlasting fame. Primitive Mass music, namely the "Kyrie", "Sancta", "Benedictus", "Gloria", and "Credo", came to its maturity in the Masses of Mozart and Hayden. The seed

of modern Western music was planted by these great musicians and the fruits of their efforts are the symphonic Masses of Schubert and Beethoven. It is not too much to say of the elaborate system of Scholasticism, represented by Thomas Aquinas, that it is based upon the transubstantial idea of the Lord's Supper. The rise of the ecclesiastical hierarchy of the Catholic Church can be stated as one of the external results of the development of Sacramentalism. This was due to the fact that the Sacrament, only through which man could be saved, was administered by no one but a member of the Catholic clergy. Political troubles among the European states before the Reformation had a close relationship to this ecclesiastical hierarchy, the source of which was Catholic Sacramentalism. The Reformation, which was an epoch-making event in both ecclesiastical and political history, had as its main polemical issue the problem of salvation, i.e. salvation by faith or by Sacramental merit. The "church" in the Middle Ages was the synonym for the "community" or "society". No one could get any social standing without making a concession to ecclesiastical authority both in opinion and deed, and he could make this concession only by Sacramental merit. Salvation to the average layman meant nothing but this concession. And, who did not hope to be saved? The Reformation was, so to speak, the substitution of faith for Sacramentalism in regard

to salvation.

In this thesis the origin of Sacramentalism is first discussed from the standpoint of the historical treatment of the Biblical accounts of the Lord's Supper. Next is taken up a study of the development of the ecclesiastical conception of this institution down to Augustine, who is called "the last of the ancients and at once the first modernist in the church". Augustine was thus phrased because the catholicity of the church, including both ecclesiastical polity and sacred theology, came to its maturity in him, thus forming an epoch between the Ancient and Medeaeval Ages of the history of Christianity.

PART I. ORINGIN OF SACRAMENTALISM

(I) WAS JESUS A SACRAMENTALIAN?

The historical sources of the discussion are the following accounts of the Last Supper.

Mt. xxvi:26-29

"And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many unto remission of sins. But I say unto you, I shall not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom."

Mk. xiv:22-25

"And as they were eating, he took bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of covenant, which is poured out for many. Verily I say unto you, I shall no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God."

Lk. xxii:17-20

"And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves: for I say unto you, I shall not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them,

saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This is the new covenant in my blood, even that which is poured out for you."

I Cor. xi:23-26

"For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till he come."

These four accounts agree in one point, that Jesus had the Last Supper with his disciples, giving them "the bread" and "the cup" with thanks to God. The first two accounts differ from the last two in one essential point. The former do not have Jesus' ordinance to observe the Supper in remembrance of him, while the last two have it. In Luke's account the blessing of the cup comes first, with variations in the words spoken, but in the case of the bread the words, except the omission of "Take", are the same as those found in Mark. Luke puts another cup after the supper, and includes Jesus' command to perpetuate the rite. Westcott and Hort, however, hold that the "This do" ordinance and the account of the cup after the supper ("which is given ----- which is poured out for you") must be later interpolations.(I) That Luke, agreeing with Paul, puts the cup before the bread may be in some respects a critical

point in the New Testament account of the Last Supper, but in other respects it is a trifle. This is due to the fact that the question can be solved by comparing it with the administration of baptism. In the case of baptism there was no objection to whether it was administered in water that was running or still, hot or cold, by immersion or affusion.(2) Paul varies the words both for the bread and cup and adds the "This do" ordinance which is supposed to have had an influence upon the Lukan account. Thus we can divide the sources into the following three parts: (i) The Markan source, which includes Mark's and Matthew's accounts, based upon the former. (ii) The Lukan source influenced by Mark and Paul. (iii) The Pauline source.

The passages in the Fourth Gospel (xiii-xvii; vi:22-59) concerning the Last Supper should not be treated from the standpoint of pure historical criticism. Of course, they are not poor in historical suggestions, but they are peculiar in their philosophical or symbolical presentation of the significance of the Last Supper.

No question about the traditional conception, that Jesus really instituted the Sacramental rite, had ever appeared in the history of Christianity until the eminent rationalist H.E. G.Paulus (professor of Jena 1789-1803 and at Heiderberg 1811-

I85I). Paulus was followed by Keiser. Paulus rejected the Christic origin of Sacramentalism, pointing out that the earliest eyewitness, Matthew, did not give Jesus' intention of ritualization of the Last Supper. Paulus concludes his discussion by insisting that the ritualistic repetition of the Last Supper which was a later gloss followed naturally the example of the Passover. David Strauss' denial is found in the first edition of his "Leben Jesu" (I835). He, however, admitted its possibility in the later popular edition of the same work, only questioning the integrity of the Biblical sources given by the Evangelists (I864). He was not prone to accept Paul's statement that he found it on his entrance into the church. Rückert and Weiss held the opinion that Jesus did not give any ordinance for a Sacramental rite to his followers, but they did recognize that Jesus had the Last Supper with his disciples for the purpose of maintaining a spiritual union between his disciples and himself even after he left them. It was in the year I892 that Jülicher (professor of Marburg) published a popular essay in which he vigorously denied Christic origin, stating that Christ's act was "a parable". Since then Spitta, Holtzmann, Anderson, Grafe, Mensigna, J.Hoffmann, Brandt, Schmiedel, Schmidt (Coronell University), Goguel, P.Gardner, Heitmüller and other scholars, one after another, have taken this negative theory. Spitta and Holtzmann maintain that the

meal was "a momentary inspiration" rather than a premeditated act in which no idea of commanding the repetition of the rite was intended. Anderson holds that it was simply a parting meal and no more. The last named is, above all, exceedingly drastic in his treatment of the Supper narratives. He discusses the derivation of Paul's Sacramental conception of the Supper and writes, without the slightest hesitation, the following statement: "Not from the preaching of Jesus, so far as we know it; not from his own peculiar idea of the Gospel; not from his Israelitish -- Judaean inheritance, so far as it was genuinely Jewish."(3) This interpretation seems, however, to hold that the Christian Eucharist is nothing but a transformation from the Greek mystery religions and is too radical to be accepted by the majority of impartial scholars of this problem.

Some leading scholars in this field of study assert, against these negative opinions, the pure Christic origin or setting of the same institution, i.e. Jesus really gave the ordinance of the Eucharistic rite. Weizsäcker and Beyschlag are the outstanding men among them. The former makes the positive assertion that the Sacrament rests on a distinct command of Jesus, while the latter insists that the institution is the most certain of all the facts recorded of Jesus, adding to it the assertion that but for this fact, i.e. Christic origin of

Sacramentalism, the whole subsequent apostolic doctrine of Christ's death is transformed into an inconceivable riddle. H.E.Dosker agrees with Banvick who says, "The Lord's Supper is instituted by Christ as a permanent benefit to his church; it is a blessing added to all other blessings to signify and to seal them."(4)

The negative theory is in the first place based on the insistence of the authenticity of the Markan account, taking for granted, from the standpoint of textual criticism, that the shorter the narrative, the more reliable. The "This do" ordinance of Jesus is absent from Mark's Gospel which is supposed to be built on the reminiscences of Peter(5) who was present at the Last Supper. Matthew's Gospel which probably followed the Markan account, likewise does not contain the ordinance. The reliability of Mark's Gospel, as a whole, of course, cannot be rejected. It does not, however, mean that Mark puts in his Gospel all of Jesus' sayings and deeds. Textual authenticity so far as the accounts in the same Gospel are concerned can no doubt be rejected, but it hardly be asserted that the accounts which Mark does not tell us are false. Mark's Gospel, the shortest one of the Gospels, may be regarded as giving us the most reliable description about Jesus but not as supplying the most ample material about Jesus' life and teaching.

Moreover, if the age in which these two Gospels (Matthew and Mark) were produced was, as Faulkner points out, the days that "the Supper was taken as a matter of course everywhere and as instituted by Jesus"(6), they would naturally omit this command popularized among the Christians. So the discrepancy of the accounts cannot necessarily be the fundamental defect of the positive theory.

Then follows the criticism of the Pauline account. Paul is, in this case, judged to be mistaken in referring to facts in Christ's life. If this be the case, then the Lukan account of Jesus' ordinance must also be treated in the same way. But this attitude is too careless to be wholly accepted. Paul, as the matter of fact, was not one of the attendants at the Last Last Supper, but the fact that he stayed in Jerusalem for fifteen days, being acquainted with Peter, the eyewitness of the Saviour, and James, the Lord's brother, is enough to suggest that he should not be wholly ignorant of direct sources of Jesus' life and teaching. It is conceivable, on the one hand, that Paul's description of Jesus' life and teaching has reliable reasons for acceptance, but it is also probable, on the other hand, that Paul, the missionary to the Gentiles, was influenced to a considerable extent by common notions and customs of religious meals among the Hellenistic people who were

believers in the so-called mystery religions, and that he applied these notions and customs to his doctrine as a means of introducing Christianity to them, even though Paul did not literally adopted pagan customs into Christianity. It was more than twenty years after Paul's conversion that he wrote his First Epistles to the Corinthians.(7) This interval leads us to two inferences: (i) Paul, who was a man of statesmanship and missionary zeal, having made the first and the second evangelical journies on the coast of the Mediterrenian Sea, turned, like many other able missionaries, various thoughts of other religions around him into the mould of Christian action. This interpretation suggests that the Pauline epistles, like that to the Corinthians, may rather be evaluated as propaganda documents. Paul obviously puts emphasis on some doctrines and rites which were mostly or entirely originated by himself, though he was influenced by Jewish traditions and pagan customs; and the Eucharistic ordinance is no exception. (ii) Paul has often been compared with eminent Greek philosophers, e.g. Socrates or Plato, because of his intellectual ability. Paul probably had a deep sense of responsibility when he wrote the First Epistle to the Corinthians. This interval must have made him a well-trained leader of the church by the aid of the Holy

Spirit, even though the dramatic part of his conversion was an ecstatic, even fanatic, event. Thus without this interval the epistle would not have been written with "a sense of responsibility, not of a modern scholars as to exact repetition of a source, but of one who stood for life and death behind his words."(8)

The most basal point of the negative theory is to be found in Jesus' personality which stood entirely against external formalism. Jesus dignified himself as the innovator of the traditional ritualism. Rashdall perhaps too hastily decides that the "This do" ordinance is a later addition. But it is improbable that Jesus, the reformer, left this kind of ritual ordinance to his disciples. Moreover, it is not likely that Jesus, who was so meek and humble as to declare that he was the servant of the race, should expect any ritual celebration in his honour. The last scene of Jesus' life in the Fourth Gospel suggests that Jesus took an entirely spiritual interpretation of religion, not ritualistic. Jesus who symbolically identified himself with "the bread of life" (John vi:35) rose from the table and washed the disciples' feet. Jesus then instructs them to love and help each other, and to follow their Master's example who had devoted himself to the service of man and the world (John xiii:4 ff). Devotional

faith, brotherly love and spiritual communion dominate the Last Supper, not any intention of institutional organization. The Synoptic Gospels never fail to maintain the spiritual and pious element of the Supper. Even in Luke's account, as Rashdall points out, we can find no suggestion, if we set aside "This do" ordinance, that Jesus had any intention of founding an institution or a permanent rite of any kind.

It cannot positively be insisted that the ordinance accounts in Luke's Gospel and in the Pauline Epistles have entirely nothing to do with the Saviour himself. Jesus undoubtedly gave the indirect cause for the ritualization of the Last Supper, for he presided the Supper by himself, and gave the disciples the bread and the cup with thanks to the Father. It does not, however, necessarily follow that Jesus is the very commander or the originator of the Sacramental institution.

In this respect, we need not hold to the absolute denial of Jesus' intention of instituting the formal rite. But we must draw a distinction between Jesus' position, i.e. indirect, and Paul's position in the development of the institution.

I cannot agree with those who hold that Jesus was a Sacramentarian, i.e. Jesus willingly instituted the Sacramental rite, on the one hand; while I cannot attribute the origin of Sacramentalism only to Paul. I dare to affirm, like T.R.Glover,

that "Jesus instituted no sacrament, yet Paul found the rudiments of them among the Christians, and believed he had the warrant for the hightening which he gave to them."(9)

(2) PAUL, THE FOUNDER OF SACRAMENTALISM

As to Paul's conception of the Lord's Supper we have the following sources, besides the passage (I Cor. xi:23-26) mentioned in the previous chapter.

I Cor. x:I6-2I

"The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a communion of the body of Christ? seeing that we, who are many, are one bread, one body: for we all partake of the one bread. Behold Israel after the flesh: have not they that eat the sacrifices communion with the altar? What say I then? that a thing sacrificed to idol is anything, or that an idol is anything? But I say, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have communion with demons. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of demons: ye cannot partake of the table of demons."

I Cor. xi:26-29

"For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord'd death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgement unto himself, if he discern not the body."

I Cor. xii:I3

"For one spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit."

One of the burning questions since the early part of the present century among German scholars like Jülicher or Deismann is, who was the real founder of Christianity, Jesus or Paul? The study of the origin of Sacramentalism gives a valuable suggestion to the solution of this problem.

As to how Paul "received" from the Lord the "This do" ordinance no one can tell. But it is possible to infer that Paul transmitted to the Corinthian Christians one of the traditions to which they professed to be holding (v:2). Paul should be regarded as the first one who institutionalized the Lord's Supper of which the source was the spirit of "communion" at the table of the Last Supper. Paul is, as A.Robertson points out,"a sure link in a chain which reached from the Lord himself to them".(1) That Paul claims that he received the ordinance from the Lord, possibly not in a direct but in a revelational sense, and delivered it to the Corinthians in a ritualistic sense would naturally be his own reply to the assertion that he, not Jesus, is the founder of Christianity, i.e. the religion of which the spiritual center is in the adoration and obedience to Jesus, the Saviour.(2)

Paul, who makes much of the sacredness of the Lord's Supper in which the body of Jesus is to be discerned (xi:17 ff), emphasizes the superiority of the Lord's Supper above pagan

sacrifices, comparing it with the cults of demons as he calls them. This conception of the cup and the bread is undoubtedly based upon the ecclesiastical interpretation of the communion between Christ and his followers. The phrases "blessing which we bless" and "which we break" (x:I6) imply ritual conception which cannot be found in the Last Supper. The recepiants are, unlike those at the Last Supper, the members of the institutionalized Christian body, not merely the band of the followers of the Saviour.

Paul proceeds to warn them not "to be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" (xi:27). He indicates nothing as to the definition of "unworthy". But Paul who refers the Supper at Corinth back to the Last Supper apparently means all that is incompatible with the spirit of Jesus who gave the disciples the Last Supper. In other words, brotherly love towards all and sound faith in Christ, i.e. the spiritual essense of the Last Supper, are expressed as the worthy means of receiving the cup and the bread. This means that both spiritual condition and ritual order in regard to the Lord's Supper are two conditions of which much must be made. Paul who makes an allusion to the "church of God" concerning the Lord's Supper (xi:22) draws a sharp distinction between two kinds of the Christian meal, i.e. the Sacramental and the social meal (xi:33 ff).

Paul, in the last mentioned passage, refers the phrase "drink in the Spirit" to the gift of the Holy Spirit in baptism. This proves, again, that Paul puts much stress on the Sacramental idea of the Lord's Supper.

It is certain that the breaking of the bread in the primitive Christian community at Jerusalem (Acts ii:42,46), with which the present writer will deal later, was not only a social meal but a religious one, though it did not carry with it all the Sacramental ideas which were associated with the Eucharist at Corinth. But it is rather an expression of the spirit of mutual aid and mutual encouragement among the Christians at Jerusalem who were recognizing the meaning of the death of Jesus clearer and clearer, and it does not necessarily imply, in the strict sense, Sacramental significance. They had not yet reached the ecclesiastical organization in doctrine and polity. We can find few evidences of Sacramentalism or of a sacrificial aspect of the meal in the Christian community at Jerusalem. It may be stated that the community was in a transition period from the evangelical band of the disciples to the ecclesiastical institution of the ancient Catholic Church. Jesus had not the slightest ambition to establish a new sect of religion but devoted himself to the innovation of the Old Testament religion, fulfilling

the law and the prophet.[3] But Paul apparently started to organize an entirely new sect of religion, i.e. the new "true" Judaism, as S.J.Case calls it,[4] of which the center is the Lord Jsus Christ, the Saviour, cutting off his relation to the tradition of Judaism.[5] The so-called Christian Sacramentalism naturally starts from Paul because the rites are, as a rule, the fruits of the notion of sect. No sectarian intention, no ritual institution.

The opinion that the Pauline doctrine of the Eucharist lacks universality because it arose, in the first place, owing to purely local causes in Corinth can easily be refuted. Almost of all rituals or doctrines start from a particular originator under a particular condition. Few have from the beginning universality. It is not unreasonable to infer that Paul's Sacramental conception developed as years passed to a universal Sacramentalism of the church.

Paul's doctrine of the Eucharist is sometimes attributed to the accidental necessity to deal with the disorders in regard to the Lord's Supper at Corinth and it is proved by the evidence that in none of the other Pauline epistles can be found any allusion to the Sacramental rite. But, is it not possible to infer that this accidental event opened the way to the very beginning of the Sacramental custom of the church?

If so, Paul is in reality the originator of Sacramentalism. It is then quite natural to state that the life of Christianity came from Jesus and the rites began with Paul. It may be stated that it was so-called historical necessity which led Paul probably sub-consciously to the adaptation to the manners and customs of the paganized community around himself. It is, as Schubert says concerning the rise of the Catholic Church, "no artificial growth, but a natural development adapted to its environment."(6)

It is also suggested that Paul had no intention of the institutionalization of Christianity on the basis of his negative statement about the rite of Baptism (I Cor. 1:14). But Paul by no means mentions the insignificance of the same rite. On the contrary, he evidently says that he baptized Crispus, Gaius, and the household of Stephens (I Cor. 1:14, 16). He was really afraid of being told by anyone that he was baptizing people into his own name (I Cor. 1:15-17). These verses are anything but the statements of the denial of Baptism, but they rather show that Paul makes much of Baptism.(7) It can hardly be infered from the point of view that Paul was unconscious of the Sacramental rite when he claimed, "we are members of his body" (Eph. v:30; I Cor. x:17). This is undoubtedly "the sacrament of corporate unity in Christ."(8)

Maurice Goguel of France and Wilhelm Heitmüller of Germany are noted for their strenuous assertions that Paul is the real originator of Christian Sacramentalism.(9) Paul's Sacramental idea is solely attributed by these scholars to his indebtedness to pagan cults. The present writer can partially agree with them, for it is not adequate to attribute the foundation of Sacramentalism to Paul as a mere plagiarist or copyist of pagan cults as these scholars do. It should be emphasized that the uniqueness of Paul's personality was such, that he could make concessions with his environment without kneeling before the pagan cults.(IO) Paul's actions and thinking was carried out "according to the laws of tendency, rather than those of logic".(II) Paul who declared, " ------- I am become all things to all men, that I may by all means save one" (I Cor. ix:I9-22), failed neither to adjust himself to his environment nor to vindicate the "Life" God revealed to him through Jesus. He was the first one who treated the Lord's Supper as if it was an existing rite in the church. This must have been adequate, if not the best, way of appealing to the Graeco-Roman world of Gentile cults. Paul never attempted to borrow anything from pagan cults, but he was wise enough to adjust his method of leadership to his religious and cultural environment. It is too much to say that Paul owes his Sacramental conception entirely to

pagan cults. That Mithraism, which had the strongest influence upon Christianity, came to its zenith more than a century later proves this. All we can state is that Paul is the founder or the originator of Christian Sacramentalism in the sense that he experienced the "Life" and visualized it in the church life through the particular form of Eucharistic communion, separating it from the Love Feast, the social communion.

(3) HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF THE ORIGIN OF SACRAMENTALISM

Jesus lived among men. Christianity in its infancy was never a phantom of wonderland. The origin and development of Christianity, including every rite and doctrine, must be treated from the standpoint of historical criticism, according to the method of the so-called Religionsgeschichte Schule, of which founder is Ernst Troeltsch. It is one thing that we should vindicate, as the followers of our Saviour, the superiority or even finality of Christianity among other religions; while it is another thing to treat Christianity from the point of view of the students of the history of Christianity as one of the religions in the process of the development of civilization. The latter, as well as the former, also leads us to find the very soul of the religion of Jesus, though the way of approaching it is different. Now, the subject of discussion, i.e.

the origin of Sacramentalism, has been brought under historical criticism, and it is to be discussed from a few historical points of view, namely its relation to the mystery religions and Judaism. This attempt will suggest to us, I am sure, the unique characteristic of Christian Sacramentalism.

(1) The Lord's Supper and The Mystery Religions

The study of the influence of the mystery religions upon the Lord's Supper must be divided into two parts; first, the Apostolic Age, and second, the third and the following centuries. The former is to be discussed in this chapter and the latter later.

The world in which Christianity was born was in a turmoil of religious cults, caused by the facility of communication of the prosperous Roman Empire. The cause of this turmoil is commonly attributed to the introduction of the mystery religions into the domain of the original state or into the local religions of antiquity. These mystery cults were the Eleusinian mysteries of Greece, the Dionysiac mysteries of Greece, the Isiac mysteries of Egypt, the Mithras cult from Persia, etc. This is the background of the present study.

The celebration of the Lord's Supper, which was derived

from tne Last Supper presided over by Jesus, found similar practices around itself in the primitive days of the Christian era. Josephus states that Julius Caesar granted permission to the Jews of the Dispersion to gather together for the purpose of celebrating common suppers and holy festivals according to the customs and laws of their forefathers.(I) Carpenter indicates two invitations to the dinner at the "table of the Lord Serapis" among the papyri recovered from Oxyrhynchus. One of these papyri contains an invitation to dine in the Serapeum.(2) The same author also points out the discovery of a large, elegant apartment in the Temple of Isis at Pompeii where such meals are supposed to have been served, and mentions that the remains of vessels and the bones of fowls around a marble table in the same apartment prove that such meals were common. He makes allusion to similar customs in Mithraism and the Therapeuts of Egypt.(3)

Each one of these mystery religions show a considerable similarity, in ritual and doctrine, between Christianity and itself. But it cannot easily be stated whether these resemblances are elemental or not. Philologists like Reitzenstein, for example, have held the opinion that the pagan words in the New Testament prove the strong influence of the former upon the latter. Reitzenstein gives a list of about one hundred and fifty words many of which he asserts to have been

borrowed by Paul from the mystery religions when he wrote his epistles in pagan environments. He, however, fails to make it clear that Paul never used these words as implying the same meaning or idea as when they are used in the mystery religions. Paul simply used them for his convenience because he regarded it wise to use the words with which the recepients of the epistle were well acquainted. When the Jesuit missionaries brought the "Glad Tidings" to Japan for the first time, about four hundred years ago, they used so many technical terms of Buddhism that the people took Christianity for a sect of Buddhism. But it never meant that they modified the Christian doctrines of God, man, life, death, salvation, justification and the like with the Buddhist conception of them. All they did was to adjust their mode and method of preaching, using Buddhist terms, to their non-Christian environment in order to get a better understanding of the Christian doctrine to their audience. Reitzenstein made the mistake, which is suggested by Groton, as follows: "One, a few thousand years from now, might as reasonably draw from the Japanese doctrine of the Amida Buddha with its strong teaching of justification by faith that Christianity as soon as it entered Japan caught up this doctrine, became Buddhistic, and is to be counted as a higher form of the Japanese Buddhist sect."(4) I cannot but agree with De Jong's opinion that many of the words in the New

Testament are identical with those found in the mystery religions, but an intentional borrowing of their idea by the Christians cannot be thought of.

It should be accepted that the mystery religions had, in regard to the Eucharistic rite, some esoteric influence upon Christianity, but it belongs to the third century and after. Jesus who preached openly to the people on the mountain, on the street and on the lakeside never made the Last Supper a mysterious rite. The Eleusinian cult began its whole ceremonial, including initiation, mystic plays, sacrifices and their common meals, with a solemn proclamation to participate in the mysteries. They rejected all except "who has clean hands, and a prudent tongue," and "who has lived well and justly."(5) Jesus did not give, on the contrary, any ritual proclamation like that before the Last Supper and he allowed even one who was going to betray him to attend the Supper with his fellow disciples (Mt. xxvi:2I; Mk. xiv:I8). The Eleusinian mysteries and the Last Supper are identified in the principle of communion with the saviour, but they are differentiated in the spirit and manner, i.e. one is esoteric and ritualistic while the other is open and friendly.

The common meal of Cybete-Attis had a genuine parallelism between the Christian Eucharist and itself, but as Firmicus Maternus claimed, "It is another food that gives salvation and

life. Seek the bread of Christ and the cup of Christ!" The communion meal of the same cult meant the materialistic or realistic type of mystical communion with the divinity because Attis himself was regarded as a "reaped ear of corn."(6) Jesus meant symbolical, not realistic, communion between the disciples and himself when he gave them the bread saying, "This is my body", and the cup saying, "This is my blood". Jesus made much of religious and spiritual communion with his disciples, but this communion was not magical. In other words, Jesus had the Last Supper for the purpose of edification, but not as the means of salvation.

Paul took over this conception of the communion meal and made it develop into a Sacramental doctrine. He holds that the Lord's Supper is a means of grace, while the mystery religions insists upon the unconditioned necessity of the sacramental meal. Groton has little doubt when he remarks that the bread and the wine in the Eucharist are regarded by Paul as active mystical agencies.(7) Faulkner, however, cannot agree with Groton and states that "by appealing to imagination and memory it could be a moral agent."(8) He eliminates every mystical element from the Lord's Supper, asserting that the bread can never be a mystical agent except by magic. But Paul, who is the proclaimer of the so-called Christ-mysticism, can hardly separated in a strict sense from a mystical conception of

the Eucharist. Paul's chief doctrines, viz. justification by faith, immanence of Christ, and the like, are not mere moral teachings but rather mystical, religious experience; and his conception of the Lord's Supper is no exception. Faulkner seems to go too far in order to vindicate Paul's independence on mystery religions in relation to the Eucharistic doctrine. That Paul had a mystical attitude toward the same rite does not necessarily mean that he borrowed or copied it from the mystery religions.

The eschatological interpretation of the Lord's Supper on the part of both Jesus and Paul ("I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until ----" "Ye do show the Lord's death till he come.") distinguishes the Supper from the feast of the mystery religions which contain no idea of this kind. Their gods deal with the affairs of the earth and the under-world, or with the productive forces of nature and death. This realistic and materialistic conception of God is far from Biblical eschatology which refers, to a large extent, to the cosmic economy of the Divine.

The common meals of the mystery religions lack the poetical, deep significance which Paul's effective, spiritual presence of Christ had in the Eucharist. The former requires strict correctness and right intonation, superficial as they are, of the word-for-word recitation of the ritual. The New Testa-

ment conception of the Eucharist, especially that of Paul, goes beyond this kind of superficial formalism, though it tended by the third century to a more or less ritualistic method. Sheldon makes clear that Paul was deeper than the pagan prosaic mind when he remarks, "he shows a certain kinship with a view of the Eucharist which had much currency among the Greek Fathers, the view namely that Christ in his spiritual nature, or as the Logos, comes into a relation with the consecrated elements analogous to that assumed to the body appropriated in his incarnation, thereby imparting to them a special efficacy."(9)

Carl Clemen states that originally, in the mystery religions, the sacred communion implied a real partaking of the divinity. This is rejected by Faulkner on the basis of uncertainty of the continuation of this kind of an idea even in the primitive Christian era.(10) P.Gardner stands against the opinion of modern anthropologist, like Frazer, in regard to Paul's conception of Sacramentalism. Frazer holds that the barbarous custom and idea of the ceremonial eating of the body of the deity, which prevailed among the people of low culture, had an influence upon the origin and development of Christian Sacramentalism. Gardner recognizes the degrading materialization of Christianity during the decay of the Roman Empire, yet he emphasizes that there is no trace of the practice of eating

the deity not only in Paul but also in any of the developed pagan cults.(11) Primitive Christians had no notion of eating Christ's body, though it is found in the mediaeval customs of the church. They observed the communion, taking up Jesus' spiritual conception of the Last Supper, as the commemoration of their Saviour. There was no materialistic, magical idea which can be found in the lower pagan cults.

The memorial communion in honour of the sacred being or divine hero was celebrated not only by Christianity but also by Mithraism. Many scholars point out the striking similarities between them.(12) Albrecht Dietrich published in 1903 an Egyptian magical papyrus, dating from 300 A.D., regarding it as a Mithras liturgy. Willoughby is of the opinion that the invocation contained in this Mithraic ritual goes back to as early as the first century.(13) But Cumon does not think it is a Mithraic liturgy at all. Though Dietrich's opinion is acceptable, the fact that Mithraism did not invade the dominion of Christianity before the second or the third century proves that Christianity is not indebted to Mithraism for the origin of Christian Sacramentalism.

Besides the points mentioned above we can find some other points of incompatibility between the mystery religions and Christianity in regard to the origin of the Eucharistic rite. The former, for example, repudiates women from the sacred

communion while the latter does not. The one uses plain water instead of wine but the other does not.

Thus, so far as the primitive days of Christian Sacramentalism are concerned, the popular application of the term "mystery religion" to Christianity among the modern scholars is not acceptable. The so-called Paulinism which took up the spirit of the Supper from Jesus (I Cor. xi:25) consequently is, as Schweitzer states it, a theological system with sacraments, not a mystery religion. We cannot but claim with Harnack that "Christianity is no mystery religion"; and with Franz Dibelius that "we have no occasion to explain the Lord's Supper by similar phenomena in the Greek and Gnostic mysteries."(14) But the story of Christianity after the third century is quite different from that of the preceeding days.

What is, then, the presupposition of the Lord's Supper? That Jesus was not the first or only one, in those days, who had this kind of a religious communion is clearly proved already. It was apparently the Passover of Judaism.

(ii) The Lord's Supper and Judaism

The study of the relation of Christian Sacramentalism to Judaism is consentrated on the relation of the Lord's Supper to the Passover. As evidence that Jesus had the Last Supper at the time of the regular Passover meal the following sources

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

are offered by the Gospel writers.

Mt. xxvi:17-19

"Now on the first day of unleavened bread the disciples came to Jesus, saying, Where wilt thou that we make ready for thee to eat the passover? And he said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The Teacher saith, My time is at hand; I keep the passover at thy house with my disciples. And the disciples did as Jesus appointed them; and they made ready the passover."

Mk. xiv:12-14

"And on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover, his disciples say unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and make ready that thou mayest eat the passover? --- and wheresoever he shall enter in, say to the master of the house, The Teacher saith, Where is my guest-chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples."

Lk. xxii:7-8, 11, 15-16

"And the day of unleavened bread came, on which the passover must be sacrificed. And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and make ready for us the passover, that we may eat."

"And ye shall say unto the master of the house, The Teacher saith unto thee, Where is the guest-chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples?"

"And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I shall not eat, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God."

In these passages we can find some positive suggestions that Jesus identified the Last Supper with the Passover meal. Above all, Luke indicates that Jesus was heartily anxious to eat the Passover meal with his disciples. The following features show that the Last Supper no doubt meant the Passover, the family group with Jesus presiding, prayers of thanksgiving for the elements, the cup -- especially twice cup-giving in

Lk. xxii:I7-I9 -- which corresponds the rite of the regular Passover, the breaking of the bread, the solemn demeanour, the exposition, and the conclusion with a hymn. But the lack of the lamb and other things like herbs,(I) just one description of the cup except the Lukan account, no indication of Jesus' washing his hands,(2) and the lack of the closing prayer disproves that Jesus observed the Last Supper as the Passover meal.

Moreover, the most important issue is the difference of the date, of the Supper, between the Synoptic Gospels and the Fourth Gospel. The latter reads as follows: "Now before the feast of the Passover" (John xiii:I), "And they themselves went not into the praetorium, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the Passover." (xviii:28), "But that we have need of for the feast" (xiii:29), "And it was the preparation of the Passover." (xix:I4), and "Since it was the preparation, and that the Sabbath day was a high day." (xix:3I).

According to the Synoptic account, the Last Supper comes on Nisan I4, while in the Fourth Gospel, on Nisan I3. In spite of the coincidence of the date among the Synoptic accounts (Nisan I4), they contain some reasonable hints that the date of the Fourth Gospel should be regarded as the correct one. There are some objections to the date in the

Synoptic accounts themselves (Mt. xxvi:3-5, xxvii:62; Lk. xxiii:54). Let us trace the last scene of Jesus' life. The Markan account tells us that the chief priests and the scribes made up their minds two days before the feast to capture Jesus with the purpose of putting him to death. It was because they were afraid of interference of the people if they would capture him during the feast.(4) It cannot be an unreasonable inference, since no contrary mention is made, that this plot of the arresters was successfully carried out. If so, Jesus had the Last Supper and was arrested on Nisan I3. It is "two days before the feast". But it is at the same time the previous day of the feast because the Passover starts on the evening of Nisan I4.(5) Then if the Last Supper came on Nisan I4 and Jesus was arrested on the same night, many things were done which were illegal or contrary to the contemporary Jewish custom: To arrest some body with swords and staves (Mt. xxvi:47 ff; Mk. xiv: 43 ff), to hold the conference of the Sanhedrin (Mt. xxvi:57 ff; Mk. xiv:53 ff; Lk. xxii:54 ff), to take the dead body down from the cross (Mt. xxvii:57 ff; Mk. xv:42 ff; Lk. xxiii:50 ff). All these were not permitted on the Sabbath. Moreover, as already indicated, the lack of the mention of their eating the Paschal lamb in the Synoptic narratives shows that the Last Supper was not necessarily the regular Paschal meal on the Passover (Nisan I4). Then the account that Jesus died

on a Friday leads us to the opinion that the Passover of this year fell on the Sabbath, which began on Friday at suset.(6)

The easiest conclusion, which may be drawn from Biblical and historical studies, makes us stand, with Westcott, Spitta and Wendt, for the date of the Last Supper held by the Fourth Gospel, i.e. the Supper took place on Nisan 13. It naturally implies that Jesus did not eat the regular Passover meal but that he took the Last Supper with some sort of a keeping of the tradition of the Passover with his disciples, probably knowing the urgent plot of his rivals. Jesus may have been attempting, at this critical point of his life which happened to fall during the Paschal season, to renew the fellowship between his disciples and himself in order to encourage them to keep better unity and brotherly love among themselves even after his death. It means that Jesus symbolically applied the custom and method of the Passover to his own new religious communion with his disciples. Jesus was not a Sacramentarian but he knew how to spiritualize and vitalize the formal traditions. Jesus should be regarded as giving true life to the traditional idea of the Passover among the Jewish people at the occasion of the Last Supper.

Paul afterwards identified the Last Supper with the Paschal meal, speaking of Jesus himself as the Christian Paschal lamb (I Cor. v:7). This comes from the conception

that regards the Lord's Supper as a commemoration of the redemption effected by the death of Jesus (I Cor. xi:26).

PART II. DEVELOPMENT OF SACRAMENTALISM

(I) THE LORD'S SUPPER IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE

Apostolic Christianity may be divided into two parts. One is the Christian community at Jerusalem of which Peter was the exponent and the other is the Gentile Christian groups on the Mediterrenian coast, led by Paul.

(i) Common Meal at Jerusalem

The Christian community at Jerusalem started its existence after the Pentecost on which occasion about three thousand new converts were, according to Luke's record, added for the first time to the band of the disciples (Acts ii:4I). The earlier chapters of "The Acts of the Apostles" give suggestive descriptions of the characteristic features of the primitive Christian community at Jerusalem, including the earliest type of the rite of the Lord's Supper, i.e. the "breaking of bread". Luke, the writer of the Acts, gives the following two passages concerning the "breaking of bread" at Jerusalem.

Acts ii:42
"And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' fellowship, in the breaking of bread and prayers."

Acts ii:46
"And day by day, continuing steadfastly with one accord in the temple and breaking bread at home they took their food with gladness and singleness of heart."

The common feeling which cover these two passages is brotherhood or fellowship among the Christians at Jerusalem. They gathered together for the purpose of both religious worship and the common meal. In other words, their gatherings contained both religious and social significance. They combined these two into one. The first passage mainly shows the religious character of the "breaking of bread" in connexion with, the apostles' teaching and prayers, while the second one mainly shows the practical application of the spirit of the "breaking of bread" in relation to their mutual aid.

As to the relation of the "breaking of bread" to the Agape some different opinions has been proposed.(I) Spitta and Jülicher hold that the Agape was the original institution from which the Eucharist was derived and that there is no distinction between them. Batiffal stands against them and maintains that the Agape itself came into existence in the third century, originally being a private supper, became a public organization in the following century. He does not

recognize any connexion between the Eucharist and the Agape, asserting that the term "Agape" in the writing of the first two centuries is nothing but another designation of the Lord's Supper itself and used for the convenience of the writers. The reason is, according to him, the fact that the spirit of the Lord's Supper of which the significance was brotherly communion, i.e. the spirit of Agape. It is true, however, that the Christians of the first century had a common meal which would correspond to the Agape. The significance of the common meal was a feeling for the remembrance of their Saviour. It accordingly implies that both the Agape and Lord's Supper were apostolic. I like to infer that every ordinary meal was positively hallowed by a devotional attitude toward the Lord and brotherly love. It is not wrong to suppose that the Christians of the Apostolic Age did not require any ritual observance as an inevitable means of salvation as did those of later days. Their daily life itself was as a rule devoted to their Lord with the earnest expectation of his bringing about the Kingdom of God, the reign of the Lord, on earth. So the common meal meant to them, things entirely different from the Eucharist after the second century. It was to them nothing but the continuation of the blessed habits their leaders had formed while with Jesus. Every meal, both in the group and at home, might have

been full of religious significance, being blessed by the prayer of thanksgiving, offered by the head of the group or of the household, when he broke the loaves of bread to pass them to the rest. This is not, in a strict sense, a rite or a ceremony, though we cannot deny some undercurrent of ritual conscience. They reminded each other in doing so the intention of Jesus to console his disciples at the Last Supper suggesting to them that his death would not be in vain. Jesus was always the unseen guest at every meal of the primitive Christians at Jerusalem, just as he was to the disciples at Emmaus. We should not interpret the "breaking of bread" in the Christian community at Jerusalem in a too strictly ritualistic sense, though it may be an anticipation of the Eucharist of later days. The lack of the cup here seems to be treated lightly by some commentators. But, it proves, it seems to me, the unritualistic attitude of the members of the Christian group at Jerusalem. That Paul speaks of the bread and the cup in the same breath must be treated as another thing. Therefore the "breaking of bread" at Jerusalem should be ragarded as the source of a renewed joy and the daily inspiration of a richer hope through their brotherly fellowship.

The common meal at Jerusalem implied an economic significance, also.(2) That it was not a rite at that time is

proved by the fact that it took place not only for the religious purpose of the remembrance of the Saviour, but also for the social purpose of enjoying a communistic life to supply the actual needs of its members. They made the common meal a means of support for the poor and the strangers in Jerusalem. But it does not necessarily mean that they attempted to establish a pure communistic society in the strict sense, as Marx and Lenin dreamed of. All that they did was to cooperate in consumption of commodities on the basis of their religious faith in brotherly love, but they did not cooperate economically in production under legal coercion as is seen in present Russia. They never attempted to carry out any new economic plan to establish a new social system, but they put the concept of the Christian family and the spirit of brotherly love into practice for the purpose of relieving the wants of the brethren. They concieved, to be sure, of every economic material -- money, food, clothing, dwelling places, soil, etc. -- as being trusted to them by God to use it in the best way and for the best end. Of course, we cannot deny other motives, of their practice of mutual aid, than simple brotherly love, viz. their earnest expectation of Christ's second advent in near future.

In summing up what has gone before, it may be stated that the Christian meetings at Jerusalem implies two kinds

of purposes, i.e. religious edification and brotherly fellowship in which the center was in the "breaking of bread" ("And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and prayers."[3]). This "breaking of bread", however, did not imply the slightest liturgical significance of the repetition of Christ's Last Supper for the memory of their Master's sacrificial death.

(ii) Pauline Conception of the Lord's Supper

The Pauline churches, of course, succeeded this tradition. But the increases in church membership brought about the complication of the church life and caused various troubles.[4] The worst example of it is found in the church at Corinth. In the days in which the Pauline epistles to the Corinthians were written the church in this prosperous city had developed, as Lindsay indicates it, to a little "self-governing republic."[5] People of every class of society -- high and low, rich and poor, capitalists and slaves -- was included in the same institution. The members of the church at Corinth, excluding catechumens and inquirers, gathered together at their meeting place every Lord's day[6] for the purpose of their thanksgiving meeting.

That the Holy Supper already implied thanksgiving and sacrifice of the partakers is proved by the fact that they brought the food and handed it over to the leaders of the feasts in order to get impartial distribution among the brethren. The feast usually was closed by the Lord's Supper or the Holy Communion. This custom, however, led the church to a terrible crisis by neglecting the sacredness of the Lord's Supper which was the very heart of the meeting and a mean impulse of appetite captured the interest of the members. Hence the troubles against which Paul gave his warning. Paul mentions the peculiarity of the Lord's Supper because of its sacredness and solemnity, drawing a clear distinction between the religious meal or the Lord's Supper and the social meal or the Agape. Paul is the first apostle who puts emphasis upon the significance of the Eucharist as the memorial rite of the death of Christ which had never been present in the Christian common meal. The conception of "Eucharistia" took its primitive beginning in the Pauline churches, and flourished among all the churches in the first half of the second century and after.

The Christian worship in the Apostolic age, as a whole, in either Pauline or Petrine communities, followed the method of the religious assemblies of the Synagogue. The latter was different from the worship of the temple at Jerusalem

in lacking in its elements bloody sacrifices, oblation of the products of the soil, firstfruits or incense. The Apostolic Christians, agreeing with this attitude of worship without the slightest hesitation, adopted four elements of the service of the synagogue. These elements were lections, chants, homilies, and prayers. But this was not all that the Apostolic Christians did. Though they took over all the religious service of the synagogue, they added to these Jewish elements one or two new, original Christian elements. One of them was the spiritual exercise and the other the Lord's Supper or the Holy Communion.

(2) SACRAMENTALISM IN THE SECOND CENTURY

During the first half of the second century, the Lord's Supper tended toward ritualization. It came to occupy the central place in Christian worship, being called the "Eucharist" rather than the Lord's Supper. The term "Eucharist" (ἡ εὐχαριστία) or "thank offering" is derived from the "giving of thanks" at the Last Supper (εὐχαριστήσας)[1]. The "breaking of bread", however, was still used in the "Didache"[2].

The materials of the study of Sacramentalism in the second century is scanty and obscure. We can find a few suggestive descriptions, about this rite, in contemporary

documents. They are incidental references in the Epistles of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, the accounts in the "Didache" (100-140 A.D.), a letter of Pliny to Trajan (Ep. X,96. 112 A.D.), Epistles of Ignatius (110-117 A.D.), apologetic writings of Justin Martyr (c. 150 A.D.), and the controversial works of Irenaeus (c. 185 A.D.). Of these sources, the "Didache" is the most primitive witness of the Lord's Supper.

(1) Didache

The integrity of the Eucharistic accounts in the "Didache" (the ninth and tenth chapters) is no longer in great debate. The depreciatory remarks by some English scholars, like Charles Gore, can easily be refuted by liberal arguments on both Catholic and Protestant sides. The Catholic side is represented by Struckmann, the Roman Catholic scholar, who calls the "Didache" the oldest post-canonical document we possess. Jean Reville, a French Protestant professor, maintains that the Eucharistic testimony of the "Didache" is of a higher value than all the other early Christian documents. Groton accepts these positive opinions, saying, "And it is, therefore, reasonable to assume that the passage in it ("Didache"), bearing on the Lord's Supper, especially

the ninth and tenth chapters, describe the sacrament as it was celebrated in the Galilean communities of the first century."(3)

The "Didache" calls the attention of its readers in regard to the manner of the administration of the Eucharist. It treats the term "Eucharist" as the equivalent of the "Agape", i.e. the common meal for the whole congregation; yet it confines the partakers only to those who are baptized.(4) Bishops are appointed with a view of administrating the Eucharistic rite. This solemn rite, i.e. the "breaking of bread", is to be held on the Lord's Day before the confession of sins, so that the partakers' sacrifice may be pure.(5) Some forms of thanksgiving are mentioned by the author in connection with the Eucharist. Two prayers of Jewish style, in character and form, remind us of the common Jewish grace at ordinary meals. Neither of them have any reference to any institutional words about the body and the blood of Christ. The one is entitled "for the cup" and reads: "We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant, which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus, Thy servant: to Thee be the glory for ever."(6) The other "for the broken bread", reads: "We give thanks to Thee, our Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou hast made known to us through Jesus, Thy servant: to Thee be the glory for ever."(7)

The author advances and gives, in the latter half of the ninth and tenth chapters, prayers for the gathering of the Church from the ends of the earth into the Kingdom. In the former the author takes an allegorical interpretation of the Eucharist, seeing the symbol of the Kingdom in the grains of wheat formerly scattered upon the mountains, and now being made into one loaf which is broken. Churches should, according to him, gather together in like manner to build up the Kingdom of God.(8) The last prayer, which is to be offered "after ye are filled", also maintains the gathering of the Church into the Kingdom. Here, the author takes a somewhat spiritual view of the Eucharist, stating that God gives eternal life to the partakers. Spiritual significance of the elements of the rite is emphasized.(9) Thus, the "Didache", from the standpoint of both terminology and interpretation of the Eucharist, may be judged to represent a transition period in the Church from the primitive to the ecclesiastical stage.(10) This is why various opinions have been held by different scholars concerning the nature and significance of the eucharistic testimony of the "Didache".

According to Anderson, the Supper in the "Didache" is not the Lord's Supper, though it is religious in its nature, because it lacks the fundamental conception of the Lord's Supper, i.e. the allusion to the precious Blood and Body

of Christ. Reville recognizes the eucharistic character of the table of the bread and wine, but no mystical communication through the elements themselves. Von der Goltze, not agreeing with them, maintains that the eucharistic prayers apparently reveal the belief in a real presence of the Lord himself within the elements. Hoffmann takes a similar realistic view, holding the presence of the blood of Christ in the cup. These realistic interpretations imply that the Eucharist is the cult of receiving the Lord Jesus Christ himself (Blood and Body of Christ) through its elements. Ripeness of realism may not fairly be found in the "Didache", yet it no doubt testifies the genuine Christian Eucharist. Interest in "Jesus Christ", the "Church" and the "Kingdom" is dominant in its description. Groton points out the importance of discerning mysticism in it. But symbolism, it seems to me, plays a more striking part. (11)

(ii) Pliny's Letter to Trajan

Pliny's letter to the Emperor Trajan gives a suggestion about the celebration of the Eucharist in the first quarter of the second century. (12) It reads as follows:

> "They were in the habit of meeting on a certain fixed day before it was light, when they sang in alternate verses a hymn to Christ, as to a god, and bound themselves by a solemn oath, ... after which

> it was their custom to separate, and then reassemble to partake of food -- but food of an ordinary and innocent kind."

This passage has often been cited as a proof of the separation between the Eucharist and the Agape because it contains two different meetings on the same day. It is clear that they had a regular service on "a certain fixed day" or Sunday before the dawn and then another later meeting. But it is doubtful that the term "oath" or "sacrament" means, as Lightfoot indicates, the Eucharist, and that the other meeting was the Agape. Lightfoot suggests that Pliny seems to confuse the two sacraments together, one is the baptismal pledge and the other the Eucharist of which administration was appropriate on the stated day before the dawn. It was, however, natural to him, because the Eucharist was usually administered immediately after baptism. (13) J.H. Srawley and Batiffol hold the uncertainty of the term "sacrament" and proposes the opinion that "food of ordinary and innocent kind" rather refers to the Eucharist. They infer that the first meeting was only for praise and prayer. Pliny's allusion that the common meal was given up after the publication of the edict of the Emperor Trajan forbidding clubs, causes Srawley and Batiffol to infer the transition of the Agape as the Eucharist to an earlier hour. It suggests that the renegades had given up the common meal but the faithful

had given up nothing.(I4)

It cannot easily be asserted, anyway, from the testimony of Pliny's letter that the Eucharist was distinctly separated from the Agape before the days of Justin, though the trend of separation, originated by Paul, was accentuated after the edict of Trajan.

(iii) Ignatius

Ignatius, bishop of Antioch in the middle of the first half of the second century (c. II0-II7 A.D.), regarded Christianity as a religion of personal salvation and related it to ecclesiastical authority. His conception of the Eucharist reflects this belief of his. The so-called seven letters of Ignatius, which are admired by McGiffert as "remarkable letters, fiery, incisive, vigorous and eloquent beyond any other writings of the post-Apostolic period"(I5) contain many striking ideas of the Eucharist. The chief passages are as follows:

Eph. V.
"If any one be not within the alter, he is deprived of the bread of God."(I6)

Eph. XX.
"Breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality, and the antidote which prevents us from dying, but a cleansing remedy driving away evil, (which causes) that we should live in God through Jesus Christ."(I7)

Phil. IV.

"Take ye heed, then to have but one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup to (show forth) the unity of His blood; one alter; as there is one bishop, along with the presbytery and deacons, my fellow servants: that so, whatsoever ye do, ye may do it according to (the will of) God." (18)

Smyrn. VII.

"They abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they confess not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins and which the Father, of His goodness, raised up again." (19)

Rom. VII.

"I seek the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ; and I seek His blood, a drink which is love incorruptible." (20)

Ignatius, who puts his emphasis upon Christ's humanity, and divinity as well, (21) maintains the necessity of mystical union with Christ for living a true life. He writes, "Christ Jesus, apart from whom we do not possess the true life." (22) This "true life" which extends to immortality can be granted only through the mystical communion with Christ at the Lord's table. We can find in Ignatius the beginning of the Hellenization of Christian thought in reference to the Eucharist which can hardly be found even in the "Didache". That Ignatius' interest was very much similar to that of the Greek mysteries is expressed in his calling his readers by the phrase, "initiated into the mysteries of the Gospel". (23) He agrees with both Paul and John in recognizing that the participation in the Eucharist promotes a union with Christ. But he proceeds further to vindicate the catholicity of the church and the

ecclesiastical authority of the bishop in regard to the administration of the same rite. He remarks: "I .... exhort you to have but one faith, and one (kind of) preaching, and one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ; and His blood which was shed for us is one, one loaf is also broken to all (communicants), and one cup distributed among them all: there is but one alter for the whole Church, and one bishop, with the presbytery and deacons, my fellow-servants."(24)

Realism and symbolism sit together in Ignatius' conception of the Eucharist. He accepts the real presence of the glorified body of Christ, on the one hand; while on the other hand he puts stress upon the significance of the Eucharist as the symbol and means of Church unity, which, he holds, depend upon the central idea of the bishop's function (Smyrn. VII.). Hence the different arguments on the passages mentioned above. There are four different views of these passages. (i) Ignatius recognizes the real presence of Christ within the Eucharistic elements: (ii) He holds the symbolical conception of the Eucharist: (iii) He has no certain view on the Eucharist: (iv) He gives no place for the Eucharist in his theology. Hoffmann maintains that Ignatius' idea of the Eucharist is a thoroughgoing realism, but the majority of modern scholars do not accept this view. Harnack

and Loofs are the leading exponents of those who deny Ignatius' realism in his passages concerning the Eucharist. Reville is so drastic that he claims Ignatius does not give any statement that the bread is the flesh of Christ and the cup contains his blood, though he accepts the idea that the Eucharistic bread is regarded by Ignatius as no common bread in its nature.

Ignatius was a heroic fighter against his contemporary heretics, the Gnostics, who began to threaten the Christian church. Their chief weapon was the so-called Docetism. Ignatius devoted himself to vindicate the historicity of Christ and the ecclesiastical authority of the Church. He took, it is plain, a realistic interpretation of Christianity, including the Eucharist. It was not, however, any more than a means of his apologetic argument. Theology in a strict sense had not yet developed to the stage of Catholic realism which produced the transubstantiational trend of the conception of the Eucharist. The Eucharist to Ignatius was, in a practical sense, a sacrament but his theology had not yet fully grown up to stand for genuine realism in the Eucharist. This is why Harnack holds that Ignatius was far from realism in many passages, though he grants that Ignatius sometimes dealt with the Eucharist in realistic terms. Harnack then quotes Höfling's remark: " The Eucharist is to Ignatius

flesh of Christ, as a visible Gospel, a kind of Divine institution, attesting the content of belief, viz. belief in the crucified flesh or institution, which is at the same time, to the community, a means of representing and preserving its unity in this belief."(25)

Sacramentalism, originally started with Paul, and formed its ecclesiastic, if not theological or doctrinal, importance in the "Didache" and Ignatius.

(iv) Justin Martyr

Justin Martyr (d. 165 A.D.) marks an epoch in the middle of the second century in the development of Sacramentalism. In other words, the Hellenization of the rite and conception of the Lord's Supper takes place in Justin's works. Chief passages are found in his "Apology" and "Dialogue with Trypho".(26)

The First Apology of Justin.

"Having ended the prayers, we salute one another with a kiss. There is then brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of wine mixed with water." (LXV)

"And this food is called among us Εὐχαριστία (the Eucharist), of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins, and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ has enjoyed. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive thee; but in like manner as Jesus Christ our Saviour, having been made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for

our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His Word, and from which our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh." (LXVI)

"And on the day called Sunday, all who live in cities or in the country gather together to one place, and the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits; then, when the reader has ceased, the president verbally instructs, and exhorts to the imitation of these good things. Then we all rise together and pray, and, as we before said, when our prayer is ended, bread and wine and water are brought, and the president in like manner offers prayers and thanksgivings, according to his ability, and the people assent, saying, Amen; and there is a distribution to each, and a participation of that over which thanks have been given, and to those who are absent a portion is sent by the deacons." (LXVII)

(27)

Dialogue with Trypho.

"And the offering of fine flour, sirs," I said, "which was prescribed to be presented on behalf of those purified from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, the celebration of which our Lord Jesus Christ prescribed, in remembrance of the suffering which he endured on behalf of those who are purified in soul from all iniquity." (XLI)

"He then speaks of those Gentiles, namely us, who in every place offer sacrifices to Him, i.e. the bread of the Eucharist, and also the cup of the Eucharist, offering both that we glorify His name, and that you profane (it)." (XLI)

The passages in the "Apology" represent Justin's "simple realism", as Batiffol calls it, while those in the "Dialogue" show his sacrificial interpretation of the Eucharist. Since there are no allusions to the Agape one must suppose that it took no place in the church service, though it was a means of fellowship among Christians. Paul's intention of making

much of the Holy Communion reached its height in Justin.(28)

The Hellenization of Christian rites and thought, attempted by the Apologists, of whom Justin was a leading exponent, is apparently discussed in Justin's writings. He confines the Eucharist to the baptized Christians only in the same strict sense that the mystery religions rejected "any atheist or Christian or Epicurian" taking part in a celebration of the mysteries.(29) This is the accentuation of the confinement in the "Didache" ("Let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist, except those baptized in the name of the Lord.") and that in the "Apostolical Constitution" ("Is there any one who has a quarrel with any? Is there any one with bad feeling?"). To Justin, the Eucharist is not only a sacrament but also a kind of mystery which should not be partaken by those who are not initiated. Emphasis on the "This do" ordinance, a cup of wine mixed with water or a cup of plain water, realistic presence of Christ's body and blood in the elements, and sacrificial interpretation of the rite -- all suggest the influence of Mithraism upon Justinian conception of the Eucharist. He probably took the conception of eating the flesh of the Divine from the mystery religion, though he was not conscious of doing it.(30) Justin accidently gives a paradoxical remark, saying; "The wicked devils have imitated in the mysteries of Mithras, commanding the same things to be done."(31)

The term "Eucharist" particularly denotes, according to Justin, the consecrated elements themselves rather than the whole rite ("This food is called among us the Eucharist."). Hence the central importance of the realistic and sacrificial idea of the Eucharist as well as its spiritual significance of the Passion of the Saviour. Rauschen identifies Justin's realism to the Roman Catholic doctrine of Presence, while Kahnis treats him as one of the most reliable exponents of the Lutheran conception of con-substantiation. But it is nothing but a result of the attempt to vindicate this great apologist's position in the history of Christianity from different points of view of the Eucharist.

Harnack's denial of Justin's sacrificial idea, in spite of the former's acceptance of the latter's realism, seeme to be unfair.(52) Justin's emphasis upon sacrificial significance of the Eucharist is found in the "Dialogue", not in "Apology". Justin makes an allusion, in the first place, to the sacrificial significance in regard to men's gratitude for the blessing of God expressed through creation and redemption, referring to Lev. xiv:10. Then he refers, like the author of the "Didache", to the prophecy of Mal. 1:11, putting his stress upon the significance of the Eucharist as the memorial service of the Passion.

In Justin's description of the liturgy, the celebrant

of the Eucharist is the "president". But it does not mean that the church in Justin's days had a peculiar office of the "President". The "president" may possibly be regarded as a common calling of either bishop or presbyter. The term "president", then, seem to be contrasted with the readers and the deacons. F.E.Brightman indicates some examples where the "president" was ordinally used as an equivalent title of the "bishop".(33)

Mention of the alms collected for the purpose of relieving those in need implies the extension of the sacrificial idea based upon the gratitude for the sacrificial death of the Saviour. The sending of the Eucharist (consecrated elements) to absent members had never been indicated by any writer before Justin. It shows a new phase of the Eucharistic rite that the private observance of the rite was granted. It is, at the same time, an extension of Catholic authority which developed throughout the ancient Catholic Church toward the Middle Ages.

(v) Irenaeus

Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons in Gaul in the latter part of the second century (d. c.200 A.D.), is, according to McGiffert, a holder of "thoroughgoing Sacramentalism".(34) Irenaeus, in his

"Against Heresies", applies extreme realism, or rather materialistic view, to some passages concerning the Eucharist.

> "Then, again, how can they say that the flesh, which is nourished with the body of the Lord and with his blood, goes to corruption, and does not partake of life? .... For, as the bread, which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly; so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity." (IV,xviii,5.) (35)

> "having received the Word of God, becomes the Eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ." (V,ii,3.) (36)

He develops the Johanine mysticism of Asia Minor and the Pauline emphasis upon the membership of Christ's body which were handed down by Justin. He holds that the true union with Christ should be accepted, in a somewhat physical sense, through the Eucharist. He finds the fundamental basis of his vindication of his own realism in Paul's epistle to the Ephesians ("We are members of His body, of His flesh, and His bones" - v:30.), and he says: "He (Paul) does not speak these words of some spiritual and invisible man, for a spirit has not bones nor flesh; but (he refers to) that description (by which the Lord becomes) an actual man, consisting of flesh, and nerve, and bones, - that (flesh) which is nourished by the cup which is His blood, and receives increase from the bread which is his body." (37) Grace of salvation, to Irenaeus, takes physical expression in the Eucharist. But, it does not

necessarily imply that Irenaeus hold the conception of transubstantiation. The realism of Irenaeus should be defined as a realistic-dynamic view.

Irenaeus' conception of the Eucharist mainly deals with the idea of the offering of the first-fruits of the earth, not with the Passion. Mal. 1:11 is again the fundamental authority for this sacrificial view of the Eucharist. This conception of his implies the significance of merit on the part of man, because his reasoning of oblation never presumes God's request of any offering but refers entirely to the expression of human gratitude toward God, bringing about the sanctification of the creature.(38)

Participation in the sacrament and obedience to the rule of the sacrament in faith and conduct open, according to Irenaeus, the only way to salvation. This is why Irenaeus has been highly ranked among the administrators and theologians of the Roman Catholic Church. He really deserves to be called the founder of historical Catholicism.

Irenaeus' realism, like Justine's, has been much disputed by recent scholars. The diversity of their opinions has come from the differences in the interpretation of the passage which contains the phrase, " .... eucharist, made up of two realities, earthly and heavenly." Some scholars refers the earthly element to the Body of Christ and the heavenly element

to the Logos (Döllinger and Möhler), while others do not (Rauschen and others). As to the heavenly element various interpretations have been offered; (i) The body of Christ (Kahnis, Harnack and Gore): (ii) The heavenly blessing of consecration (Steiz): (iii) The spirit of God which has descended on the elements (Loofs); etc. Another question deals with the degree of Irenaeus' realism, viz. transubstantiation (Struckmann), non-transubstantial presence (Rauschen), symbols of unity of Christ (Ebrard), etc.

The difficulties which have arisen from the diversities mentioned above, however, may be dissolved when we focus our attention on Irenaeus' enthusiastic controversy between the Gnostic heretics for the purpose of vindicating the finality of the religion of Christ and the catholicity of the church of Christ. He was never a diletante theologian. His theological statement, including Eucharistic realism, always stood for "all or nothing". The Christian church in his days indeed was facing "its gravest crisis since the Pauline battle for freedom from law"(39). Irenaeus' thoroughgoing realism surely corresponds to Paul's strongest emphasis upon "salvation by faith".

(vi) Summary

The second century, so far as Sacramentalism is concerned,

is a transition stage, viz. the trend of separation of the Agape from the Eucharist, the influence of Mithraism uon Eucharistic celebration, and the increase of ecclesiastical elements in the same rite. A sacred painting discovered in I896 in the Greek chapel at Santa Priscilla is supposed to belong to the second century. Carpenter's description of this painting gives us a vivid picture of the Eucharistic celebration in those days. "The congregation - represented by five men and one woman - are seated at the table on which are bread and fish and cup, and large baskets of bread are placed on each side. The president stands on the left and stretches his hand to the loaves before him." Then he makes an allusion to the early catacomb of St.Domitilla and the church of SS.Marcellino e Pietro which also offer some interesting archaeological materials concerning the Eucharistic rite in the second century. The former represents bread and fish on its walls. The latter contains a drawing which shows the same offerings, and the two women, personified symbols of love (Agape) and peace (Irene), who stand on either side, being ready to mingle the cup of water and wine. These materials testify that the Agape and the Eucharist were not strictly separated, and that the influence of Mithraism is obvious, especially in the mingling of the cup of water and wine. (40)

(3) SACRAMENTALISM IN THE ANCIENT CATHOLIC CHURCH

The Christian Church at the end of the second and following centuries advanced her course of ecclesiasticism. The canons of the New Testament and the Rule of Faith or the Apostles' Creed (The Old Roman Symbol) were the main productions of the apologetic attempts of the church in those days. These doctrinal or theological tasks naturally accomplished the development of a system in the field of church polity. The rise of ecclesiastical hierarchy, the diocesan system and the liturgical improvement were the characteristic features in the administration of the Ancient Catholic Church. Celebration of the Sacraments accordingly came to take a chief portion of church service, being influenced by the ecclesiastical tendency mentioned above. They attached, above all, great importance to the celebration of the Eucharist as the central element of the service.

(A) GREEK FATHERS

(1) Origen and his Followers

The intellectual theology of Alexandria reached its climax in Origen (186-254 A.D.), a gifted scholar, who followed Pantaenus and Clement of Alexandria as the leader of the Catechetical School of Alexandria (202-251 A.D.). Alexandrian

allegorism in theology exerted a considerable influence upon Origen's conception of the Eucharist. Origen is noted by his controlling spiritualism and allegorism in his Eucharistic view. It is the maturity of Clement's conception of the Eucharist -- the participation in the Lord's incompatibility (Paed. ii,2) and the apprehension of the Divine power and essence (Strom. v,10). This neo-Platonic theologian, who holds that the church has her "alter", consecrated by the "precious Blood of Christ", took a mystical interpretation of the bread of the Lord's Table. The bread is, according to Origen, "Sacerdotal Bread", or "a kind of holy body"; and to receive the bread naturally implies "to receive the Body of the Lord". He called the rite "the sacraments of the Lord's Body". Intellectualism and allegorism of Alexandria led him to regard the bread and wine as an allegory or a symbol. The following passage shows the essence of his interpretation of the Eucharist: (I)

> The Homily on St.Matthew, 85.
> "For it was not that visible bread, which was holding in His hand, that God the Word called His Body; it was the word as a symbol whereof that bread was to be broken. Nor was it that visible cup, that wine was to be poured out -- Why did he not say, This is the Bread of the New Testament? Because the bread is the word of the knowledge of Christ. Since then the covenant of God is placed in the blood of the passion of Christ, so that we are saved by faith and not by righteousness, it is said of the chalice alone, This is the cup of the New Testament."

The outstanding points of Origen's view of the Eucharist can possibly be found in his anti-materialistic standpoint.

He recognizes the presence of Christ in the elements in respect of spiritual, not physical, reality. Origen's spiritualism is in striking contrast with Irenaeus' realism. The former is based upon a speculative idea of the Logos, while the latter upon the physical incorruptibility of Christ's body. Nothing could be more opposite than these two different views. There is no room in Origen's opinion for the doctrine of transubstantiation. The wine, therefore, stands for Christ's soul, but not blood; while the sacrifice of Christ was for his soul and not for his body. Origen, then, claims that the Eucharist is food for the soul only. He makes no inference of imparting bodily immortality through the bread and wine.

It cannot easily be asserted that Origen's pure spiritual point of view was literally followed by his followers. Still, Origen's conception of the Eucharist influenced them to a large extent. They were, for example, Gregory of Nazianzen who treated the elements as "antitypes of the body and blood of Christ". Eusebius of Caesaria who used the equivalent term "symbol" in his argument on sacrifice, and Basil the Great and Macarius the Elder who agreed with each other to recognize no place for the actuality of the body and blood of Christ in the reception of the Eucharist. Athanasius undoubtedly took up Origen's theological standpoint in general.

But, so far as his coception of the Eucharist is concerned, he was more strongly influenced by Irenaeus than Origen. It may possibly be infered that the terms "symbol" or "antitype" in the arguments on sacrifice, among the followers of Origen, proves that the influence of this Antiochian doctrine of the Eucharist influenced them. This was due to the Eucharistic doctrine of Eustathius of Antioch, i.e. the so-called "symbolic-sacrificial" view. The pure spiritualism of Origen was modified by the ethical symbolism of the Eucharist, i.e. the "bloodless and reasonable sacrifice" (Eusebius of Caesaria) or the "sacrifice without blood" (Gregory of Nazianzen). This modification implies, in short, that the real, historic blood and body of Christ are symbolized in the Eucharistic elements, and no more.

(ii) Cyril of Jerusalem

Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem (347-348 A.D.), represents a new phase in the development of Sacramentalism. He includes in his Eucharistic theory every outstanding features of previous teaching, viz. the literal interpretation of the words of institution, the acceptance of Origenistic words "symbol" or "type", and the Athanasian term "spiritual bread" and "spiritual drink". Cyril stands for the invocational power which

makes the bread Christ's body and the wine his blood. But Cyril goes beyond Irenaeus' realistic-dynamic view in that he held a mysterious "change" or "conversion" of the elements. He emphatically remarks that "the seeing bread is not bread, though sensible to taste, but the Body of Christ; and that the seeing wine is not wine, though the taste will have it so, but the Blood of Christ."(2) He attributes the Eucharistic gifts to the declaration of Jesus who miraculously turned water into wine at Cana. "Since then", he says, "he (Jesus) himself declared and said of the bread, 'this is my body', who shall dare to doubt any longer? And since he has himself affirmed and said 'this is my blood', who shall ever hesitate, saying that it is not his blood? He once in Cana of Galilee turned the water into wine, akin to blood, and is it incredible that he should have turned wine into blood?"(3) The invocation of the Holy Spirit is, according to Cyril, the very cause of the mysterious change in the Eucharist. "We pray God", he writes, "to send forth his Holy Spirit upon the gift lying before him; that he may make the bread the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ; for whatsoever the Holy Ghost has touched is surely sanctified and changed."(4)

Cyril was, it is true, the first one who proposed, in the history of Sacramentalism, the miraculous change of the

elements. No one had ever conceived of the elements in so mysterious a respect as he did. But it does not mean that he was the originator of the theory of transubstantiation which prevailed in the Medeaval church. The last mentioned passage should especially not be taken in a literally sense. He regards, on the contrary, the real sense of eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ as the nourishment of the soul by the Logos incarnate. Cyril deals with the problem of the Eucharist from the standpoint of a catechist, not from that of a scientific theological study. To take his idea of "change" or "conversion" too seriously means to misunderstand him. Definite theological application of this idea, i.e. acceptance of transubstantiation, is not yet peculiar in the works of Cyril.

The realistic-dynamic and the symbolic-sacrificial views which preceded Cyril have now been synthesized in his idea of the conversion of the elements.

(iii) Gregory of Nyssa and Theodore of Mopsuestia

Cyril's "conversion" theory of the Eucharist found its own eminent apology in a voluminous works of Gregory of Nyssa (d. 397 A.D.). Gregory deals with the question of the Eucharist in the thirty seventh chapter of "The Great Catechism".(5)

He maintains that the "participation and mingling " with Christ in the Eucharist extends its effectiveness not only to the soul but also to the body of the participants. He takes up, first of all, the question of the nourishment of Jesus Christ, the Logos, on the earth. According to Gregory, bread and wine gave nourishment to the body and blood of Christ by means of digestion when he was on the earth. That Christ's body, thus nourished, by the complete union with the Logos, was raised to the supreme dignity of the Godhead. Gregory infers, from this supposition, that the bread and wine of the Eucharist, in like manner, takes mysterious transformation into the body and blood of Christ. In the Eucharist it is not necessary, as it was in Christ's earthly life, to eat and digest the elements, for the bread and wine consecrated by the Eucharistic invocation immediately transform then into the body and blood of Christ.

The literal acceptance of Gregory's interpretation leads us to regard him as the originator of the theory of transformation. Transformation is next to transubstantiation in the development of Sacramentalism. Still, Gregory cannot possibly be supposed as willingly proposing the theory of transubstantiation, because he apparently meant "sanctification" by "transformation", not "transubstantiation". "Change" is, to him, change of relation between Christ and man, not

that of material change. His language, as in the case of Cyril of Jerusalem, must not be taken too literally. Here, again, transubstantiation had not yet found its proper place in Sacramental doctrine. It is true, however, that Gregory's vindication of the rationale of the Eucharistic mystery opened the way to the expansion of the use of the terms "change" or "conversion" among the Latin theologians though the rationale itself was not necessarily in favour of them.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 429 A.D.) took a spiritual interpretation of the Eucharist, calling the elements "symbols". But he used, without the slightest hesitation, with Gregory, Cyril's term "conversion".

(iv) Chrysostom

Chrysostom (d. 407 A.D.) who maintained a realistic conception of the Eucharist, indicating the mysterious power of the elements,[6] spoke of the elements, like Gregory, as refashioned and transformed.[7] Chrysostom does not, however, insist upon a materialistic transformation. The gift of the Eucharist, according to Chrysostom, is refered to mental, not sensible, perseverance. His instruction reads as follows: "Thus let us do in the mysteries also, not looking at the things set before us, but keeping in mind His sayings. ---- For Christ hath given nothing sensible, but though in things

sensible yet all to be perceived by the mind."(8) Chrysostom then emphasizes that the Lord's Table stands for the Last Supper administered by Christ himself. Solemnity and sacredness of the rite must carefully be kept by the participants. He remarks thus: "He who sanctifieth and changeth them (elements) is the same. Let then no Judas be present, no covetous man. If any one be not a disciple, let him withdraw, and the table receiveth not such. For 'I keep the passover', He saith, 'with my disciples'"(9)

(B) LATIN FATHERS

(i) Tertullian

Tertullian (c. 155-225), who first wrote in Latin, was a typical Latin scholar. His legalistic attitude toward Christian doctrine is found in his conception of the Eucharist. His leading idea in regard to the Eucharist is that of "sacrifice" or "oblation". It naturally led him to regulate strict rules for the rite. Characteristic passages are found in "De Corona" or "The Chaplet".(10)

> "We take also, in congregations, before daybreak, and from the hand of none but the president, the sacrament of the Eucharist, which the Lord both commanded to be eaten at meal-time, and enjoyed to be taken by all alike (men and women, rich and poor). As often as the anniversary comes round, we make offerings for the dead as birthday honours. ---- We feel pained should any wine or bread, even though our own, be cast upon the ground."

It seems that the Eucharist in those days had, to a considerable extent, the elements of the Agape. But the outstanding idea of "sacrifice" easily leads us to infer that this idea urged the separation of the one from the other. Tertullian makes much of the ecclesiastical office of the bishop (president), and the administration of the Eucharist is exclusively confined to them. The celebration of the Eucharist in commemoration of the dead is already prevalent among the Christians of Tertullian's days. Beneficiency of "sacrifice" extends to the dead.

The blood of Christ on the cross was, to Tertullian, something sacred and productive of redemptive effect.(11) Tertullian emphatically claims the wonderful, vital power of the acceptable sacrifice to God upon men's poor and worthless flesh. It is on the body and blood of Christ that our flesh is fed in order "that the soul may fatten on its God".(12)

The body and blood of Christ in Tertullian's Eucharistic view imply the body crucified and the blood shed on the cross. The same preciousness as in the great sacrifice offered by Jesus himself takes its existence in the elements of the Eucharist. The bread and wine which symbolize the body and blood of Christ in his Passion is, to Tertullian, primarily to be offered, not to be received. Tertullian made a full use of the term "sacrifice".(13) Tertullian's sacrificial

conception was taken up and enlarged by Cyprian.

(ii) Cyprian

Cyprian (200-258 A.D.) regarded the Eucharist as a symbolic commemoration of the Passion. The Eucharist is, in other words, the sacrament of Christ's Passion and of man's redemption. He very often uses the term "sacrifice" for "Eucharist" or "Sacrament", and draws an analogy between the sacrifice in the Old Testament and the Eucharist. The Eucharist, therefore, stands for the Passover of the new covenant.(I4)

Cyprian, under whom the catholicity of the Ancient Catholic Church reached its full development,(I5) made the chief business of bishops "to serve the alter and to celebrate the divine sacrifice".(I6) Hence the Eucharistic sacerdotalism of Cyprian. The Lord's Supper to Cyprian was ecclesiastical penence, and, the bishops accordingly were priests. The Eucharist was at once an inevitable means of propitiation. The sacerdotal system of the Eucharist, of which the germ is found in Tertullian's view, is now at its zenith in Cyprian. The striking emphasis was, by Cyprian, put on the doctrine of grace through the church. Salvation is due to God's grace upon men. But, on what condition is divine grace granted to men? The legitimate celebration of the Eucharistic sacrifice in the ecclesiastical sense, it is

plain to Cyprian, constitutes the fundamental condition. Cyprian then requires the bishops legal, not necessarily religious, qualification as the administrators of the Sacrament. "According to Cyprian",remarks McGiffert, "the sacraments are valid when performed by priests of good character and sound faith."(17) But, Cyprian, in reality, went farther than that. Cyprian maintains that the Eucharist celebrated by a heretic or a schismatic bishop, though he is a man of faith and virtue, is invalid; while the rite performed by a Catholic bishop, even if he is not sound in faith and character, is valid. His sacerdotalism culminates in his statement: "There is no salvation out of the church."(18) His opinion concerning the baptism written to Jubaianus shows his strict principle of sacramental sacerdotalism.(19) It reads as follows:

> "For if, some suppose, one could receive anything abroad out of the Church according to his faith, certainly he has received what he believed; but if he believes what is false, he could not receive what is true; but rather he has received things adultrous and profane, according to what he believed."(20)

It is remarkable that the customs of sacrifice for martyrs and of infant communion, in addition to the memorial Sacrament for the dead, prevailed in the contemporary church. It was a regulation of Cyprian that "the cup should be mingled with a union of wine and water."(21) Cyprian shows that the symbolic elements possess almost magical power.("In profane body and

mouth the Eucharist could not remain; the draught sanctified in the blood of the Lord burst forth from the polluted stomach. So great is the Lord's power, so great is His majesty."[23]) But this does not necessarily imply the idea of transubstantiation. Cyprian really did not go farther than the symbolic-sacrificial view. He put more emphasis on the sacerdotal regulation of the sacramental rite than the material conversion of the elements.

(iii) Ambrose and Pseudo-Ambrose

Ambrose (340-397 A.D.), bishop of Milan, was one of the authoritative teachers of the Latin Church. The influence of Greek theology upon Ambrose was by no means little. The term "conversion", used by Cyril of Jerusalem and Gregory of Nyssa, was taken by Ambrose, side by side with the sacrificial conception of Tertullian. The so-called pseudo-Ambrose, i.e. "De Mysteriis" and "De Sacramentiis", led this transubstantiational tendency to its height. A height not hitherto attained. These two treatises, in fact, played an important part in the history of Sacramentalism in the West.

"De Mysteriis", IX, 52.

> "Thou hast read of the whole creation that he spoke the word, and they were made; he commanded and they were created. The word of Christ could made out of nothing that which was not; cannot it then change the things which are into that which they were not?"[24])

"De Sacramentiis", IV, 4, 14.

"When it comes to the consecration of the venerable sacrament, the priest no longer uses his own language, but he uses the language of Christ. Therefore, the word of Christ consecrates this sacrament."(25)

"De Sacramentiis", IV, 4, I5.

"What is the word of Christ? That, to be sure, whereby all things made. The Lord commanded, and every creature was produced. Thou seest, therefore, there is such power in the word of Christ. If, therefore, there is such power in the word of the Lord Jesus, that the things which were not began to be, how much more is it effective, that things previously existing should, without ceasing to exist, he changed into something else?"(26)

"De Mysteriis" and "De Sacramentiis" developed and enlarged the teachings of Cyril of Jerusalem. Cyril analogized the change in the Eucharist with Christ's miracle at Cana. Pseudo-Ambrose went farther than Cyril and found parallels to the conversion of the elements in the miracles of Moses, Joshua, Elisha, and in the virgin birth. He thus attributes these miracles to the miraculous act of the Godhead and goes back even God's miraculous act of creation.(27)

Ambrose recognized a change of nature in the consecrated elements. But, what he meant by the term "change" was "transfiguration". "De Mysteriis", on the other hand, conceived of the body of Christ as a "spiritual body" or "the body of divine spirit, because Christ is a Spirit" and it was accordingly regarded as the "spiritual nourishment of our souls".(28) "De Sacramentiis" held to a materialistic conception. Participation in the Eucharist means reception of "the likeness of the

death" and therefore it is nothing but the reception of "the body of Christ" itself.(29) This idea, to be sure, strengthened the trend toward transubstantiation. This is why "De Sacramentiis" was used as a weapon for vindicating the belief in transubstantiation when the Eucharistic controversies were aroused by Paschasius Radbert in the ninth century and by Berengar in the eleventh.

(iv) Augustine

The influence of the transubstantiational teaching of the pseudo-Ambrose was remarkable in the Latin Church of the fourth and later centuries. This was not, however, the controlling trend among the Latin theologians. Augustine (354-430 A.D.), bishop of Hippo, checked this trend and delayed for some centuries the unanimous acceptance of the Ambrosian view of the Sacrament in the Latin Church. Augustine's view is fairly expressed in one of his treatises as follows:(30)

> "On the subject of the sacrament, indeed, which he receives, it is first to be well impressed upon his notice that the signs of divine things are, it is true, things visible, but that the invisible things themselves are also honored in them, and that that species, which is then sanctified by the blessing, is therefore not to be regarded merely in the way in which it is regarded in every common use."

He, again, states in another place as follows:(31)

> "The word is added to the element, and there results

the sacrament, as if itself also a kind of visible word."

What Christ delivered to his disciples at the Last Supper was, according to Augustine, the "figure" or "sign" of his own body and blood.(32) Augustine's teaching in regard to the actual presence of the body and blood is not to be taken in respect to transubstantiation. His realistic view, like that of Tertullian, declines toward symbolism rather than transubstantiation. He explains his own realistic view of the Sacrament in his letter addressed to Boniface, his colleague in the episcopal office.(33) It reads as follows:

> "For if sacrament had not some points of real resemblance to the things of which they are the sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all. In most cases, moreover they do in virtue of this likeness bear the names of the realities which they resemble. As, therefore, in a certain manner the sacrament of Christ's body is Christ's body."

Augustine draws a sharp distinction between the "sacrament" and "the virtue of the sacrament". To Augustine, the sign is one thing and the thing signified is another. He distinguished the Eucharistic body of Christ from the historical body of Jesus. But it does not mean that there is no relation between them. He recognized, to be sure, that the spiritual essence of Christ's humanity took a new symbolic existence in the Eucharist. In other words, the human body of Christ in the Eucharist, according to Augustine, took its real presence in the highest spiritual respect. This is why Augustine has

been regarded by some scholars as holding the so-called "receptionist" theory of the Eucharist. It seems, however, to be more adequate to call Augustine's idea of the Eucharist a "dyophysite" theory.

Augustine conceived of the Eucharist as a sacrifice implying a twofold spiritual significance. The blood of Christ, in the first place, affords in the soul of the faithful confidence of the forgiveness of sin. He says: "And what will a convert not be forgiven, if the shedding of Christ's blood is forgiven ?" (34) In the second place, it reveals the love of God. Men are made children of God through the virtue of Christ's blood. (35) Christ's blood plays an important part in Augustine's sacrificial conception.

The beneficiance of the Eucharist as sacrifice extends, as in the case of Cyprian, even to the departed. Augustine appreciates here the infinite mercifulness of God. As to the frequency of the Eucharistic rite, Augustine writes "to his beloved son Januarius" that the practice is different in different places and countries, e.g. daily celebration; offering on stated days; Sacrament on Saturday and the Lord's day, or only on the Lord's day. (36)

The validity of the Sacrament was treated by Augustine with a more generous view than that of Cyprian. He, as a matter of fact, confined it to the administration of ordained

clergymen. But he did not deny heretic or schismatic ordination. If the Eucharist be celebrated by an ordained priest, Catholic or Donatist, in accordance with the liturgical form of the Catholic Church, without the slightest relation to his own faith and character, it is thoroughly valid. As to the effect upon the recepients, Augustine mentioned, recalling Paul's warning to the Corinthians, that if they are not faithful enough to receive the beneficience of the Eucharist the rite would do harm them rather than good.

This view of Augustine came from his putting emphasis on the unity and sanctity of the Catholic Church. He hated to reordain a priest, even if he were, for example, a Donatist, because Augustine made much of the authority of Ordination. Ordination should be celebrated for every priest, including Catholic priests and their rivals, once and for all throughout his life. Ordination itself, not its ritualistic details, consecrates him as a priest of God. In the case of the Eucharist, the Catholic tradition in its spirit and form was insisted by Augustine as the foundation of its validity, because the Eucharist is not a hierarchical rite like Ordination, but the rite which is the inevitable means to the salvation of men. One Ordination and one Catholic Eucharist --- this paradoxical combination is a dominant feature in Augustine's view of the celebration of the Eucharist.

(C) SUMMARY

In the early days of the Ancient Catholic Church (3-5 centuries) Sacramentalism was peculiar in these two respects; first, the idea of the real presence of Christ, and second, the view of the sacrifice to God. The former, however, had not yet been put into a definite theological conclusion in regard to the manner and condition of the presence of Christ. the trend toward transubstantiation was strengthened in the days of Ambrose, i.e. the latter half of the fourth century, but it was not able to attain a full development. The second point, i.e. sacrificial view of the Eucharist was an urge to a symbolical interpretation, on the one hand; while on the other it extended its effectiveness even to the dead, to say nothing of the living. The social character of the Eucharist as a brotherly fellowship, which was prevalent in the primitive Christian community, was almost out of sight in these later days.

CONCLUSION

The idea of communion can pssibly found in every religion in the world in various types and forms, and Christianity is no exception. This is a universal desire among human being, since they are without exception incurably religious and are social animals by nature.

That the Last Supper, which was primarily spiritual, came to take the form of ecclesiastical Sacramentalism, as time has passed on, is quite conceivable. In this respect, we cannot but accept the evolutionary view of Religionsgeschichte Schule originated by Troeltsch. The whole process of the development of Sacramentalism, especially before it took a final theological formula of transubstantiation, presents a panoramic picture of the movement of human religious aspiration toward God amid the turmoil of rivalling thought, viz. Hebraism and Hellenism, Judaistic religion and mystery cults, Latin ideas and Greek thought, etc. Adoption, adaptation and amalgamation, through dialectic process, gave the Christian Sacramentailsm its uniqueness, i.e. mystical "forgiveness" through partaking of the Eucharist celebrated in commemoration of the vicarious death of Christ.

Liturgical additions have been made, stage by stage, to the primitive idea of Christian fellowship. Means became object. The common meal in the primitive Christian community

was a means of brotherly fellowship, while the Eucharist in the Ancient Catholic Church was a sacrament which implys redemptive power as its essential entity.

The burning aspiration of men toward salvation in sacramentalism was vindicated in the development of Christianity in the Graeco-Roman world.

N O T E S

PART I. ORIGIN OF SACRAMENTALISM

(I) WAS JESUS A SACRAMENTALIAN?

(I) This passage (Lk. xxii:I9b-20) is called by Westcott and Hort a "western no-interpolation". From every text except the western, it is absent, namely Codex Bezae, several Old Latin MSS and Old Syrian MSS (cf. Robinson's art. in EB. vol. II, col.I4I8f.). J.A.Findlay supposes that it is inserted from I Cor. xi:23f (ABC. vol.II, p.I054). Cf. A.Plummer's textual criticism which agrees with later interpolation theory (ICC. vol.XXX, p.496f.) and W.Sanday's opinion (HDB. vol.II, p.636). Verse I7 is regarded by those who agrees with Westcott and Hort as taking the place of the narrative in Matt. and Mk. about the cup, which preceeds the blessing of the bread. This interpolation, however, naturally shows that the sacramental significance of the acts of Jesus is indicated only in the case of the bread. Goguel says that the first cup is intended to represent that which is found in the beginning of the Paschal ritual, while the second cup is placed, as in the Paschal ritual, at the end of the meal. Batiffol and Blakiston regard vv.I5-I8 as a doublet, containing a distinct account of the supper (HERE. vol.V, p.540b). The text of Westcott and Hort, according to Blass, may be regarded as representing a transition between two types of text, the one containing only vv.I5-I8, the other being that represented in the received text of Luke. On the former supposition the whole of v.I9 would be an interpolation from Paul; and Luke, like the Fourth Gospel, would then contain no account of the rite.

(2) Cf. Didache, Chap.VII.

(3) Quoted by W.M.Groton, "The Christian Eucharist and the Pagan Cults", p.I23.

(4) ISBE. vol.III, p.I925.

(5) Montefiore : "The Synoptic Gospels", 2nd ed. (I927), vol.I, p.xxxix ff.; also Moffatt : "An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament", 3rd ed. (I929), pp.I9I,I92, 227.

(6) Faulkner : Burning Question in Historic Christianity, p.II.

(7) Paul's conversion is dated by Turner in 35-36 A.D. ; by Harnack in 30 A.D. ; by Ramsay in 33 A.D. ; by Bacon 38 A.D. Date of the First Epistle to the Corinthians is commonly

regarded as 53 A.D. (Peritz, ABC., p.879), or 57 A.D. (Turner, HDB. vol.I and A.Robinson, ICC., vol.XXXV.)
(8) Faulkner, op.cit. p.I2.
(9) T.R.Glover : The Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire. p.I58.

(2) PAUL, THE FOUNDER OF SACRAMENTALISM

(I) A.Robertson : The First Epistle to the Corintnians (ICC. vol.XXXV.). p.243.
(2) Ibid. p.243.
(3) Cf. Matt. v:I7ff.
(4) S.J.Case : The Evolution of Early Christianity. p.I7I.
(5) Cf. Gal. i:II; ii:I5ff, iii:23ff; I Cor. i:22ff; Rom. ii:I7ff; iii:2Iff.
(6) Hans von Schubert : Outline of Church History (Eng. tran. by A.Gardner), I907. London. p.43.
(7) Cr. Rom. vi:3f.
(8) T.A.Robinson : EB. vol.II, col.I42I.
(9) The following scholars stand for Pauline origin of Sacramentalism : O.Pfleiderer, Anrich, H.Holtzmann, Harnack, Hoffmann, Weinel, Wrede, Bouset, Leitzmann, Stark, Carl Clemen, etc.
(I0) Cf. Groton, op.cit. p.I5I.
(II) P.Gardner : Historic View of the New Testament. p.230.

(3) HISTORICAL CRITICISM OF THE ORIGIN OF SACRAMENTALISM

(i) The Lord's Supper and Mystery Religion

(I) Josephus : The Jewish Antiquities, xiv, 8. (The Works of Flavius Josephus, Vol.I, p.487. I890. Philadelphia. Eng. tran. by Wil.Whiston.)
(2) J.E.Carpenter : Phases of Early Christianity. p.259.
(3) Ibid. p.259f.
(4) Op.cit. p.I23.
(5) Origen : Against Celsus. III, lix, 59. (ANF. Vol.I, p.487.).
(6) Willoughby : Pagan Regeneration. p.I55.
(7) Op.cit. p.I42.
(8) Op.cit. p.36.
(9) Shedd : The Mystery Religion and the New Testament. p.I29f.

(I0) Op.cit. p.37.
(II) P.Gardner : The Religious Experience of St.Paul. pp.I20-I2I.
(I2) Willoughby, op.cit. p.I62. Halliday : The pagan Background of Early Christianity. p.28Iff. Thefollowing scholars maintain this opinion : Carl Clemen, O.Pfleiderer, H.Holtzmann, Heitmüller, etc.
(I3) Op.cit. p.I63.
(I4) Groton, op.cit. p.I23f.

(ii) The Lord's Supper and Judaism

(I) The element of the Passover meal consists, in the introductory part, wine, herb with salt water and unleavened cake; while in the meal proper, lamb, horse-raddish, unleavened bread, soup, fish, etc. (CE. vol.XI, p.5I2f.)
(2) The president of the meal washes his hands twice. One comes after the first cup and the other in the beginning of the meal proper or the second part. (Cf. CE. vol.XI, p.5I2f)
(3) Ibid. p.5I4.
(4) Mk. xiv:I-2. Cf. Mt. xvi:I-4.
(5) CE. vol.XI, p.5I2b. JE. vol.IX, p.548. "It would appear that, according to contemporary Jewish practice, Passover, the I4th Nisan, was spoken of as the beginning of the feast 'Mazzoth', though originally Unleavened Bread began on I5th Nisan. But only work for preparing food was permitted from the sunset of the 2Ist." (HDCG. vol.II, p.65a)
(6) Cf. Mk. xiv:I,2.
(7) As to the significance of the Last Supper various opinions have been maintained by different scholars, viz. association with other similar Jewish religious meals (Goltz), an acted parable of the coming death of Jesus symbolized with the breaking of the bread and the outpouring of the wine (Jülicher), Jesus' declaration to abrogate the Old Covenant with the purpose of the inauguration of a new relationship between the disciples and God (Holtzmann), spiritual food and drink (Harnack), Messianic feast, i.e. eschatological interpretation (Spitta and Schweitzer), and sacrificial meal (Justin). Cf. ERE. vol.V, pp.540-543.

PART II. DEVELOPMENT OF SACRAMENTALISM

(I) THE LORD'S SUPPER IN APOSTOLIC AGE

(I) Cf. ERE. vol.I, p.166f.

(2) Cf. McGiffert : The Apostolic Age, p.67. Also cf. Foakes Jackson and Lake : The Beginning of Christianity. vol.IV, pp.27-30.

(3) T.M.Lindsay classifies the Christian meetings in the Apostolic Age into three kinds and they are the meeting for edification, the meeting for thanksgiving (Eucharistia), and the congregational business meeting. This is, however, true to the fact in the latter half of the Apostolic Age, not in the first half. (The Church and Ministry in the Early Centuries. Lect. II.)

(4) Acts xx:7-12 suggests the increasing formal trend in the primitive church.

(5) Op.cit. p.54.

(6) Didache. XIV,I. "And on the Lord's Day of the week come together, and break bread, and give thanks -----." Cf. Acts xx:7.

(7) Cf. Duchesne : Christian Liturgy. pp.46-48.

(2) SACRAMENTALISM IN THE SECOND CENTURY

(I) Cf. Mk. xiv:23 ; Mt. xxvi:27; Lk. xxii:19; I Cor. xi:24.

(2) Chap.14.

(3) Op.cit. p.158.

(4) "But let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist, except those baptized into the name of the Lord; for as regards this also the Lord has said 'Give not that which is holy to the dogs.'" (IX;5)

(5) "And on the Lord's Day of the Lord come to-gether, and break bread, and give thanks, having before confessed your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure." (XIV,I)

(6) IX, 2.

(7) IX, 3.

(8) "As this broken bread was scattered upon the mountains and gathered together became one, so that Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom, for Thine is the glory and the power through Jesus Christ for ever." (IX, 4)

(9) "Thou gavest food and drink to men for enjoyment that they might give thanks to thee; but to us thou didst

freely give spiritual food and drink and eternal life through Thy servant." (X, 3I)

(I0) The reason why I take this opinion is clearly read in Heussi's most appropriate statement, "About 50, he was of the church who had received baptism and the Holy Spirit and called Jesus, Lord; about I80, he who acknowledged the rule of faith (creed), the New Testament canon and the authority of the bishops." (Heussi : Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte. p.44.)

(II) Op.cit. p.I60f.

(I2) Pliny : Letters. X, 96. (Loeb Classical Library. vol. II, pp.404-405.)

(I3) Lightfoot : Apostolic Fathers. Part II, vol.II, p.5If.

(I4) ERE. vol.V, p.546b. Also, Ibid. vol.I, p.I96b.

(I5) A.C.McGiffert : A History of Christian Thought. vol. I, p.57.

(I6) ANF. vol.I, p.5Ia.

(I7) Ibid. vol.I, p.57b.

(I8) Ibid. vol.I, p.8Ia.

(I9) Ibid. vol.I, p.89a.

(20) Ibid. vol.I, p.I04.

(2I) "Stop your ears, therefore, when anyone speaks to you at variance with Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was descended from David, and was also of Mary; who was truely born, and did eat and drink. He was truely crucified, and (truely) died, in the sight of beings in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth. He was also truely raised from the dead." (Trall. IX; ANF. vol.I, p.69f.) "He was truely of the seed of David according to flesh, and the Son of God according to the will and the power of God." (Smyr. I; ANF. vol.I, p.86a.)

(22) Trall. IX. (ANF. vol.I, p.70a.)

(23) Eph. XII. (ANF. vol.I, p.55.)

(24) Phil. IV. (ANF. vol.I, p.8Ib.)

(25) Harnack : History of Dogma. vol.I, pp.2II-2I2.

(26) ANF. vol.I, pp.I85-I86.

(27) Ibid. vol.I, p.2I5.

(28) It is not doubtful that in the middle of the second century the Eucharist was distinguished from the Agape, and took the most important part of the Sunday worship. As the reason of this detachment several facts are indicated by different scholars. Chief reasons might be as follows: (i) Edict of Trajan, forbidding clubs; (ii) Increase of the members of the church made it difficult to exercise a solemn celebration of the united Eucharist; (iii) Disorder in the common meal caused by the class-consciousness among the attendants; (iv) Increasing complexity of liturgical form;

(v) Confinement of the administration of the Eucharist to the bishop. Cf. EB. vol.II, col.I245. Also, Carpenter : Phases of Early Christianity. p.262.

(29) Hatch : The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usage on the Christian Church. p.286.

(30) Willoughby, op.cit. p.I62f; Harnack, op.cit. vol.I, p.2I2; A.Weigall : The Paganism in our Christianity. p.I47; Groton, op.cit. p.I67.

(3I) Apology, LXVI. (ANF. vol.I, p.I85b)

(32) Op.cit. p.2I2.

(33) F.E.Brightman : Terms of Communion, and the ministration of the Sacrament, in Early Times. II. (H.B.Swete : Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry, p.394.)

(34) McGiffert, op.cit. vol.I, p.I47.

(35) ANF. vol.I, p.486.

(36) Ibid. vol.I, p.528.

(37) Ibid. vol.I, p.528.

(38) Ibid.vol.I, p.483f.

(39) W.Walker : A History of the Christian Church. p.53.

(40) Carpenter, op.cit. p.264.

(3) SACRAMENTALISM IN THE ANCIENT CATHOLIC CHURCH

(I) Bigg : Christian Platonists of Alexandria. p.266.

(2) Catechetical Lectures, XXII (On the Mysteries, IV.). 9. (NPNF. ser.2, vol.VII, p.I52.)

(3) Ibid. XII (On the Mysteries, IV.). I-2. (NPNF. ser.2, vol.VII, p.I54.)

(4) Ibid. XIII (On the Mysteries, V.). 7. (NPNF. ser.2, vol.VII, p.I54.)

(5) NPNF. ser.2, vol.V, pp.504-506.

(6) Homilies on St.John. XLVI,3; XLVII,I. (NPNF. ser.I, vol.XIV,pp.I66f.)

(7) Homilies on St.Matthew. LXXXII,5. (NPNF. ser.I, vol. X, p.495b f.)

(8) Ibid. LXXXII,4. (NPNF. ser. I, vol.X, p.496a.)

(9) Ibid. LXXXII,4. (NPNF. ser.I, vol.X, p.496a.)

(I0) De Corona. III. (ANF. vol.III, p.94b.)

(II) Cf. Ibid. III. "At every forward step and movement, at every going in and out, when we put on our clothes and shoes, when we bathe, when we sit at table, when we light at lamps, on caouch, on seat, in all the ordinary actions of daily life, we trace upon the forehead the sign (of the Cross)." (ANF. vol.III, pp.94-95.)

(I2) On the Resurrection of the Flesh. VIII. (ANF. vol. III, p.55Ib.)
(I3) On Baptism. III. (ANF. vol.III, p.670.)
(I4) Ep. LXII, I-5. (ANF. vol.V, pp.358b-360a.)
(I5) Cf. Ep. XXXIX-XLIII,5; also, Ibid. LI-LV,24.
(I6) Ep. LXVIII,I. (ANF. vol.V, p.370.)
(I7) Op.cit. vol.II, p.37.
(I8) Ep. LXXII,2I. (ANF. vol.V, p.348.)
(I9) Ep. LXXII, 5. (ANF. vol.V, p.38Ia.)
(20) Ep. XXXIII-XXXI, 3. (ANF. vol.V, pp.3I2b-3I9a.)
(2I) On the Lapsed(Treaties, III). 25. (ANF. vol.V, p.444.)
(22) Ep. LXII, 9. (ANF. vol.V, p.360b.); Ibid. LXII, I3. (ANF. vol.V, p.362a.)
(23) On the Lapsed(Treaties, III). 25. (ANF. vol.V, p.444a.); also, Ibid. 26. (ANF. vol.V, p.444b.)
(24) T.Thompson's translation. p.69.
(25) Ibid. p.II0.
(26) Ibid. p.II0.
(27) Cf. De Myeteriis. IX, 5I-52; De Sacramentiis. IX, 4, 5I-52.
(28) De Mysteriis. IX, 58. (Thompson's translation, p.72.)
(29) De Sacramentiis. IV, 4, 20. (Thopmpson's translation, p.II3.)
(30) On the Catechising of the Uninstructed. 26, 50. (NPNF. ser.I, vol.III, p.3I2a.)
(3I) On the Gospel of St.John. LXXX, 3. (NPNF. ser.I, vol. VII, p.344b.)
(32) On the Psalms. III, I. (NPNF. ser.I, vol.VIII, p.5a.). Augustine's definition of sacraments, including the Eucharist, as "a visible sign of invisible grace" has unanimously been accepted by Catholic theologians. This has been attributed to Augustine since the twelfth century as his spiritual definition of sacraments. This definition, however, is not found in any of Augustine's writings. (Cf. McGiffert : A History of Christian Thought. vol.II, p.3I5 n.)
(33) Ep. XCVIII, 9. (NPNF. ser.I, vol.I, p.4I0a.)
(34) On the Gospel of St.John. XXXVIII, 7. (NPNF. ser.I, vol.VII, p.2I9b.)
(35) On the Psalms. CXXII, 5 ff. (NPNF. ser. I, vol.VIII, p.594 ff.)
(36) Ep. LIV, 2. (NPNF. ser.I, vol.I, p.300.)

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Angus, S. : The Religious Quest of the Graeco Roman World. 1929. C.Scribner. New York.

Bigg, C. : The Christian Platonists of Alexandria. (2nd ed.). 1913. Clarendon Press. Oxford.

Carpenter, J.E. : Phases of Early Christianity. 1916. Putnam. New York.

Case, S.J. : The Evolution of Early Christianity. 1914. The University of Chicago Press.

Clemen, C. : Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources. 1912. T.T.Clark. Edinburgh.

Duchesne, M.L. : Christian Worship (Eng. tran. by M.L.McClure). 1923. S.P.C.K. London.

Faulkner, J.A. : Burning Questions in Historic Christianity, Chap. I-III. 1930. Abingdon. New York.

Foakes-Jackson, F.J. and Lake, K. (editors) : The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. II, V. 1922-33. Macmillan. London.

Gardner, P. : Historic View of the New Testament. 1904. Adam & Charles Black. London.

Gardner, P. : The Religious Experience of St.Paul, Chap.V. 1911. Wil. Norgate. London.

Groton, W.M. : The Christian Eucharist and the Pagan Cults. 1913. Longmans. New York.

Halliday, W.R. : The Pagan Background of Early Christianity, Lect.X. 1925. Hodder & Stoughton. London.

Harnack, A. : Bible Reading in the Early Church -- Crown Theological Library, Vol.36. (Eng. tran. by J.R.Wilkinson.). 1912. Putnam. New York.

Harnack, A. : History of Dogma, 7 vols. (Eng. tran. by N. Buchanan.). 1897. Roberts Bros. Boston.

Hatch, E. : The Influence of Greek Ideas upon the Church, Lect.X-XII. (The Hibbert Journal, 1892, 4th ed.). 1892. Wil.Norgate. London.

Hyde, W.W. : Greek Religion and its Survivals. 1923. Marshall Jones. Boston.

Lake, K. : The Earlier Epistles of St.Paul, Chap.IV. 1911. Rivingtons. London.

Legge, F. : Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, 2 vols. 1915. The Cambridge Univ. Press.

Lightfoot, J.B. : The Apostolic Fathers, Part I, Vol.II. 1889. Macmillan. London.

McGiffert, A.C. : A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. 1928. C.Scribners, New York.

McGiffert, A.C. : A History of Christian Thought, Vol.I. 1932. C.Scribners. New York.

Montefiore, N.T. : The Synoptic Gospels, 2nd ed., Vol.I. 1927. Macmillan. London.

Oesterley, W.O.E. : The Jewish Background of Christian Liturgy. 1925. The Clarendon Press. Oxford.

O'Leary, De Lacy. : The Apostolical Constitution. 1906. S.P.C.K. London.

Robert, A. and Donaldson, J. (editors) : The Ante Nicene Fathers, Vol. I, III, IV, V, IX. 1885. The Christian Literature Pub. Co. Buffallo.

Rohling, J.H. : The Blood of Christ in Christian Latin Literature before the Year 1000. 1932. The Catholic University of America. Washington.

Schaff, P. : The Creeds of Christendom, Vol.I, II. 1877. Harper. New York.

Schaff, P. (editor) : A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Ser.I (I886-I890), vol.I, III, VII, VIII, IX, X, XIV; Ser.II (I890-I894), vol.V, VII, IX. The Christ. Lit. Co. New York.

Schaff, P. : The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. I885. Funk and Wagnals. New York.

Scott, E.F. : The Beginnings of the Church, Chap.VIII. I9I4. C.Scribners. New York.

Shedd, H.C. : The Mystery Religion and the New Testament. I9I8. Abingdon. New York.

Shotwell, J.T. : A Study in the History of Eucharist. I905. Eyre and Spottiswoode. London.

Swete, H.B. (editor) : Essays on the Early History of the Church and Ministry, Chap.6. I9I8. Macmillan. London.

Waizsäcker, K.H. : Apostolic Age of the Christian Church, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (Eng. tran. by J.Miller.). I897-I899.

Weigall, A. : A Paganism in our Christianity, Chap.XI-XIV. I928. Putnam. New York.

Willoughby, H.R. : Pagan Regeneration. I929. The Univ. of Chicago Press. Chicago.

Commentaries

The Abingdon Bible Commentary. I929. Abingdon. New York.

Box, G.H. : Tne Historical and Religious Background of the Early Christian Movement.
Davies, J.N. : Matthew.
Davies, J.N. : Mark.
Findlay, J.A. : Luke.
Garvie, A.E. : John.
Burch, E. W. : Acts.
Howard, W.F. : First Corinthians.

The International Critical Commentary. C.Scribners. New York.

Allen, W.C. : St.Matthew. (I907)
Gould, E.P. : St.Mark. (I896)
Plummer, A.P. : St.Luke. (I896)
Bernard, J.H. : St.John. (I929)
Robertson,A. and Plummer,A. : I Ep. to Cor. (I9II)

Peak, A.S. (editor) : A Commentary on the Bible.
Thomas Nelson. New York.

Bartlet, H.T. : Religious Background of the N.T. Writings.
Emment, C.W. : The Apostolic Age and the Life of Paul.
Murray, G.G.A. : Pagan Religion at the Coming of Christianity.
Garvie, A.J. : Matthew, Luke.
Wood, H.C. : Mark.
Booke, A.E. : John.
Menzies, A. : Acts.
Peake, A.S. : I Cor.

Dictionaries and Encyclopedias

The Catholic Encyclopedia. I909. Robert Appleton. New York.

Pohle, J. : "Eucharist", vol.V, pp.572-590.
Hassett, M.M. : "Early Symbols of the Eucharist", vol.V, pp.590-592.
Meier, G. : "Eucharistic Congress", vol.V, pp.592-595.

Encyclopaedia Biblica. I90I. Macmillan. London.

Robinson, J.A. : "Eucharist", vol.II, col.I4I8-I426.

Encyclopedia Britanica, IIth ed. I9I0. LOndon.

Conybeare, F.C. : "Eucharist", vol.IX, pp.868-876.

Encyclopedia Britanica, I4th ed. I929. London.

Raticliffe, E.C. : "Eucharist", vol.VIII, pp.793-798.

Encyclopedia Religion and Ethics. I9I2. C.Scribners. New York.

Macleon, A.J. : "Agape", vol.I, pp.I65-I75.
Srawley, J.H. : "Eucharist", vol.V, pp.540-563.

Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible. I908. C.Scribner. New York.

Plummer, P. : "Lord's Supper", vol.III, pp.I44-I50.

Hasting's Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. I908.
C.Scribner. New York.

Stone, D. : "Lord's Supper", vol.II, pp.63-67.

Hasting's Dictionary of the Apostolic Church. I9I6.
C.Scribner. New York.

Clayton, G.H. : "Eucharist", vol.I, pp.373-377.

The Jewish Encyclopedia. I907. Funk and Wagnals. New York.

Hirsch, E.G. : "Passover", vol.IX, pp.548-556.

End of

Origin and development of sacramentalism

This title was preceded by

The geography of the Gospels

And is continued by

Immortality in Plato in the New Testament and in modern Christian thought

A proposed religious education curriculum for a girls' high school in Japan

Search by above titles on archive.org to continue reading this collection of Pacific School of Religion Theses from 1934 call number Thesis Cage 1934 v.2